

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LI

MARCH, 1953

NO. 1083

The Common Good

MOST REV. JOHN J. WRIGHT, D.D.
Bishop of Worcester

*Reprinted from the COMMONWEAL**

MORAL and legal philosophies at the moment tend to polarize around one or the other of two seemingly contrary, and sometimes conflicting, goods: the good of the individual and the good of the collectivity. Those who are preoccupied with the primacy of individual good tend to take their stand or find themselves accounted with the parties of the Right in our era of State Socialism. Those who tend toward the collective good, and consequently give place of primacy to the rights of the State, turn up in our day in the ranks of the Left.

Unfortunately the social philosophies to the Left and those to the Right have polarized at their extremes, with a consequent bitter antagonism between those in both camps who might normally be mod-

erate. This antagonism is reflected in the spirit of suspicion with which men approach those who disagree with them, however slightly, on social legislation. It is reflected also in the intemperate name-calling by which men of "conservative" instinct or judgment increasingly find themselves dismissed as Fascists or reactionaries, while those of more "liberal" impulse or vision find themselves decried as if they were revolutionaries or anarchists.

Even more disastrous is the manner in which extremists on every side become symbols and spokesmen of the camps with which they are identified, even when they are neither typical nor worthy representatives of these camps but, more often than not, unwelcome nuisances to their own side of Center.

Unfortunate, too, is the resultant "guilt by association" among sincere political "conservatives" and honest social "liberals" who find themselves cut off from equally honorable and sincere citizens in the opposite political or social camp because of the sharply polarized divisions of contemporary opinion. This paralyzing sense of guilt is intensified, to the great hurt of all concerned, by the embarrassment these same good men find in the intellectual and moral company they must keep on their own side as a result of this same polarized condition of political thought. And so, high-minded "liberals" are too often associated with actual or potential traitors; while great-hearted "conservatives" are frequently distressed to find themselves tarred with the same stick as bigots, misanthropes and the hard-of-heart generally.

THE SAVING WORD

What to do? The time-tested philosophy of Christendom, blending the hope of Hebrew prophecy, the wisdom of Greek speculation, the sanity of Roman law and the charity of Christian Revelation, had a phrase which provides the saving word. That philosophy spoke of a third good, with richly personal elements, yet truly public in its nature. That third good, conciliating and unifying, is more humane than the mere good of the State; it is more generous than the mere good of the

individual. It is what the scholastic philosophers of Christendom and the Founding Fathers of America called the "common good."

Devotion to the "common good" may yet rally in a single cooperative effort generous "conservatives" and thoughtful "liberals." That which constitutes the "common good" of political society, Jacques Maritain reminds us, is not only the collection of public commodities and services — the roads, ports, schools, etc., which the organization of common life presupposes; it is not merely a sound fiscal condition of the state and its military power; it includes also the body of just laws, good customs and wise institutions which provide the nation with its structure; the heritage of its great historical remembrances, its symbols and glories, its living traditions and cultural treasures. The "common good" includes all of these and something more besides — something more profound, more concrete and more human. It includes, above all, the whole sum of these: a sum which is quite different from a simple collection of juxtaposed units. Even in the mathematical order, as Aristotle pointed out, 6 is not the same as 3 plus 3. A victorious army is immeasurably more than the mere physical total of the strength or even the valor of the individuals who compose it. A symphony orchestra is made up of so many players plus the director, but

the whole, in this case, is much more than the mere sum of its parts.

The "common good" so conceived is not only a collection of advantages and utilities; it is strongly moral and ethical in its content. It includes elements of rectitude and honor, of morality and justice. Only on condition that it embrace these is the "common good" truly such: the good of a people living in a community, the good of an organized human city, rather than the booty of a pack of thieves or common hoard of a mob of gangsters.

For this reason, perfidy, the scorn of treaties and of sworn oaths, political assassination and unjust war, even though they may be useful or advantageous and, in this sense, "practical" goods, actually contribute to the destruction of the true "common good."

Here again M. Maritain is our guide: the "common good" is always ethically good. Included in it, as an essential element, is the maximum possible development, here and now, of the persons making up the united multitude, to the end of forming a people organized not by force alone but by justice. Historical conditions and the still inferior development of human society make difficult the full achievement of the ends

of social life. But the end to which it tends is to procure the common good of the multitude in such a way that the individual as a person gains the greatest possible measure compatible with the good of the whole. The economic guarantees of labor and capital, political rights, the moral virtues and the culture of the mind, all contribute, through the "common good," to the realization of this individual independence.

The "common good" includes, we have seen, the cultural, historical and spiritual heritage shared by the group, as opposed to the heritage particular to any individuals within the group. It is difficult to analyze the elements of this heritage. But every now and again someone speaks out above the general din of dissident voices and utters ideals common to all, words expressive of our heritage of "common good."

Abraham Lincoln was a Republican; he lived in a specific period of American history; he presents strongly individualistic traits; he was a partisan of the Northern cause in the War between the States. It is difficult sometimes to appreciate that millions of sincere Americans profoundly disliked some of his ideas, deplored many of his policies, distrusted him personally. But when he

spoke at Gettysburg, he spoke for all Americans.

Woodrow Wilson was a Democrat. He, too, lived in a particular period of our national history and a specific phase of our emergence into the international community. He had marked individual traits, many of which his friends found amiable, others of which his critics found distasteful. Whole areas of his political philosophy were unacceptable to millions of his fellow citizens and some of his policies provoked the resentment of many. Yet in his public pronouncements he frequently transcended the inevitable limitations of himself, his times and his political context.

THE "COMMON GOOD"

Who in this land does not feel the tug of a sentiment which is common to the hearts of us all when he reads the magnanimous phrasing of Wilson's declaration of war against the German Government and not the German people? Who is cold to the exalted address to the Military Academy at West Point, in which Wilson summarized so many of the elements of our "common good" and linked them, as the common good must always be linked, to the benign purposes of God and to the secrets of God's Providence? Said Wilson on that occasion:

... America came into existence for a particular reason. When you look about upon these beautiful hills and

up this stately stream, and then let your imagination run over the whole body of this great country from which you youngsters are drawn, far and wide, you remember that while it had aboriginal inhabitants, while there were people living here, there was no civilization which we displaced. It was as if in the Providence of God a continent had been kept unused and waiting for a peaceful people who loved liberty and the rights of men more than they loved anything else, to come and set up an unselfish commonwealth. It is a very extraordinary thing. You are so familiar with American . . . history that it does not seem strange to you, but it is a very strange history nonetheless. There is none like it in the whole annals of mankind—of men gathering out of every civilized nation in the world on an unused continent and building up a polity exactly to suit themselves, not under the domination of any ruling dynasty or of the ambitions of any royal family; doing what they pleased with their own life on a free space of land which God had made rich with every resource which was necessary for the civilization they meant to build upon it.

So the "common good" is all the heritage from the past and all the hope for the future which good men share under God. Common to many, it is therefore *public*; perfective of the individual, it remains somehow *personal*. It calls the individual out of himself to share things with the general community, but it puts the resources of the general community at the service of the things closest to the person of the individual. That is what Cicero meant when he defined the "common good," the *res publica*,

in terms of a nation's altars and hearthsides, of the spiritual and domestic values which center about these and which serve personality: *in aris et focis est res publica.*

Out of this concept of the "common good" our forefathers derived their notion of the great object of the state's existence. Hence their fine old phrase "the common weal," a phrase perpetuated in the name by which the civil community is designated in my home State, not by the cold, collective name so dear to the totalitarian, "the State," nor by any name suggesting special interest or partisan emphasis, as "the Duchy" or "the Realm"—but "The Commonwealth"—"The Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

The "common good" is preserved and promoted by the nurse who braves the danger of personal infection in order to serve that good; by the scientist who forfeits individual convenience in order to increase it; by the parent who foregoes individual advantage in order to rear future citizens to enhance it; by the saint who renounces individual pleasure in order to sanctify it; by the soldier who disciplines individual preference in order to defend it; by the party or regime or even the national state which abdicates particular claims or narrow prerogatives in order to conciliate those who share it.

It was the good which was beloved by King St. Louis of France when he

subordinated both the instincts of self and the claims of his state to a higher welfare shared with others. His counselors unanimously rebuked St. Louis for excessive generosity in giving to the English King land which the French had regained from British conquest. Louis did not concede the English claims and he could easily have vindicated his own by force, but still he freely yielded the land. He said:

My Lords, the land that I give him I give not because I am under obligation either to him or to his heirs, but so that there may be mutual love between my children and his. And it seems to me that I am making good use of what I give him, since it makes us join hands in common love who were before at odds.

The "common good" is the mutual bond of all who love the good, the true and the beautiful; who seek good things, not evil; who seek not only the private good of persons or the collective good of the state, but the good of both, in and under and through the Supreme Good, which is God. It is the good which God gives to us all in order to keep us together, as opposed to the good that He gives to us each to keep to ourselves. It is the good before which, on due occasion, both individual and state are obliged to bow.

Out of a reaffirmation of the reality and claims of the "common good" there would come many results greatly to be desired. A quickened appreciation of the "common good"

would turn the tide against the reckless setting of class against class, the irresponsible incitement of group against group. It would coordinate anew the interests and the efforts of labor *plus* management, tradesmen *plus* intellectuals, statesmen *plus* generals, as against the present so frequent pitting of good men against other good men in the conflicts of labor *versus* management, intellectuals *versus* tradesmen, statesmen *versus* generals within the same nation and presumably seeking the same good.

Such an appreciation of the "common good" which unites, as against—or, rather, as *above*—particular or factional or partisan goods which divide, would make possible the "Vital Center" for which certain political philosophers are pleading, a "Vital Center" which can exist only when honorable moderates of "Right" and "Left" prefer working with each other in behalf of the "common good" to working with extremists of their own respective camps, extremists who seek only the particular good after which their side aspires.

The conscientious citizen who walks a little left of center, freed from the embarrassment of constant association with senseless revolutionaries, should be able to make common cause in the quest for the common good with the no less honorable citizen who steers his course a little right of center and is too often

condemned as the friend of soulless reaction.

A clearer concept of the reality and the rights of the "common good" may suggest a formula for planning a better international order, to conserve the values of the established nations, but also to be enriched by other, perhaps more basic and humane supra-national values, as little by little we come to appreciate how much of our heritage out of the past and our hopes for the future are shared within all nations.

Finally, a new emphasis on the nature of the "common good" will reorient the minds of men toward other goods, higher goods which transcend mere private advantage or even temporal common weal. The longer men meditate on the nature and the notion of the "common good," the more surely will they come to understand that there is no true good so secular, so of the earth and earthly, but that it comes from God, has been hallowed by His Christ and, by its consecrated use, can be a means to Heaven.

There is no "common good," no truly human heritage or valid hope of any people, which lies outside God's Providence, is not bound up with His purposes, is not somehow predestined, however natural it be in itself, to find its place in the supernatural order that God has revealed, and through which all things created are finally brought back to Him.

Blessed Pius X

THOMAS E. KISSLING

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

THE beatification of His Holiness Pope Pius X, on June 3, 1951, a ceremony witnessed by many pilgrims from the Americas, marked the first time since 1672 that a pope has been beatified. Of a total of 262 popes listed in the *Annuario Pontificio*, 83 have been canonized and seven beatified. Pius X, who died in 1914, is the eighth declared Blessed.

Included among the Saints are St. Peter and his immediate 55 successors, most of whom died martyrs to the faith. Pius V, last pope beatified, was proclaimed Blessed 100 years after his death by Pope Clement X, and was canonized, in 1712, by Pope Clement XI. Previous to Pius V, the last pope canonized was Pope Celestine V, who was elected in 1294, and who renounced the throne the same year. Pope Clement V canonized him in 1313. Another Pope of the name Pius, St. Pius I, eleventh Pope, reigned from 158 to 167 and died a martyr.

So the beatification of Pius X, by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, is indeed a historic event and a major step toward his canonization. It occurred only 37 years after his death, whereas

normally this step may begin only 50 years after the death of the candidate. The present Pontiff has shortened this period.

In the little village of Riese, in northern Italy, the future Pope Pius X was born June 2, 1835, the son of peasant folk—Giovanni Sarto, who died in 1852, and Margherita (Sanson) Sarto, who died in 1894, in her 81st year. One of nine children, the future Pope was baptized Giuseppe Melchiore Sarto, on June 3, in the parish church and there he received First Holy Communion at the age of eleven. The rudiments of his religion were taught to him by his pious parents, who instilled a deep Christian life in the hearts of their children. A friend of the family records that they began the day "by prayer and examination of conscience in common; all confessed their faults, and asked pardon of those they had offended, an excellent custom which was observed in the Sarto family as in the early days of Christianity."

In such surroundings, "Beppo," as he was familiarly known by his family and friends, received his early schooling. He next spent four years

* New Haven 7, Conn., June 1951.

at Latin School in the neighboring city of Castelfranco. Here he showed evidence of extraordinary intellectual talents, high moral character and solid piety. Each day he would walk the three miles to school, with only a piece of bread or corn-cake in his pocket. A typical peasant boy, he traveled most of the journey barefoot. In September, 1850, young Joseph Sarto entered the seminary at Padua, taking advantage of a scholarship. He attracted the attention of his superiors by winning first honors in his class.

When the young seminarian was seventeen, his father died, a heavy blow to the large family. But Joseph's mother insisted that he continue at the seminary. And there he stayed, excelling in all his studies, until his ordination on September 18, 1858, in the cathedral at Castelfranco. Father Sarto's first appointment was as a curate, at Tombolo, where he served under the wise guidance of Archpriest Antonio Constantini. The old priest, after observing the labors of Father Sarto, wrote these prophetic lines:

They have sent me as curate a young priest with orders to mould him to the duties of a pastor; in fact, however, the contrary is true. He is so zealous, so full of good sense and other precious gifts that it is I who can learn much from him. Some day or other he will wear the mitre; of that I am sure. After that—who knows?

Following eight years work in the

Tombolo parish, Father Sarto, then 32, was appointed in 1867 to be Archpriest of Salzano, one of the most favored pastorates in the Diocese of Treviso. Here he again distinguished himself by his devoted care for souls, taking particular care with the teaching of catechism and delivering his sermons. While here he helped to improve the temporal condition of his parishioners by opening a free night school, co-operative associations and rural banks. Nine years later Bishop Zinelli rewarded his faithful labors by naming him canon of the Cathedral at Treviso. He was also appointed chancellor of the diocese, and served as spiritual director of the seminary.

CONSECRATED BISHOP

When the Diocese of Mantua became vacant, Pope Leo XIII, in November, 1884 named Canon Sarto to fill the difficult post. Consecrated on November 16, 1884, Bishop Sarto entered into Mantua in April of the following year. Conditions in the diocese had defied the efforts of two of his immediate predecessors. Hostile political forces had hampered the work of the Church there. The priests were poor and negligent. He immediately set to work on his seminary, taught several subjects there and gave the future priests his devoted attention. In his first pastoral letter to his flock he stated: "I shall spare myself neither care, nor labor, nor vigils for

the salvation of souls. My hope is in Christ. . . . Although I know that I am not sufficient for the burden, my strength is in Him."

Peace and order soon reigned and Bishop Sarto's reputation for zeal, piety and prudence in the government of his diocese received wide notice. Revival of catechetical instruction for young and old was soon brought about with the establishment of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in every parish, by sermons and lectures on the Bible. To aid his poor, it is said that he would pawn his silver, his watch, even his robes. Nine years as "Apostle of Mantua" brought him the praise of Pope Leo XIII. "We congratulate you, Our beloved son, who has guided so worthily the Church of Mantua—truly a good shepherd of the people." On June 12, 1893, Pope Leo XIII created Bishop Sarto a Cardinal and three days later named him Patriarch of Venice. For the first two years of his service the civil government refused to recognize the appointment, since it had not been consulted.

When he entered his patriarchal city, on November 24, 1894, he received a hearty welcome from his people. His work at Mantua, his kindness and geniality, his ceaseless work for the spiritual and social needs of the souls under his care were well known. Pleased with his appointment, the Venetians presented him with a beautiful and richly decorated gon-

dola. For ten years as Patriarch of Venice, Cardinal Sarto continued to be the zealous shepherd of his flock and instituted many projects for their benefit. Humility, wisdom and holiness marked his every endeavor.

One contemporary characterized him at this period as "the social-political Cardinal, the benefactor of the individual poor, a successful intermediary between employer and the employe in their disagreements . . . he vanquished the extreme and revolutionary elements in politics and religion."

Ever interested in the struggling Catholic press, he many times rendered financial assistance. On one such occasion he declared that he would rather pawn his crozier and his purple than see a paper go out of existence. He managed with great tact to keep up friendly relations with the State officials, without compromising his position. As Patriarch of Venice he won for himself the love of the faithful and the respect of his opponents.

ELECTED POPE

On July 20, 1903, the great Pope Leo XIII died, and the Cardinals hastened to Rome for the Conclave to elect his successor. On July 26, Cardinal Sarto waved good-bye to his people as he boarded a train, with a return ticket in his pocket, so sure was he that he would soon return to them and his many projects in Ven-

ice. A few days later, August 4, 1903, he was elected Pope.

It was Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, first American cardinal to attend a Papal conclave, who greatly influenced this selection. Commenting on Cardinal Sarto's persistent desire not to be considered as a candidate for election, he relates:

At every scrutiny, seeing his name become more and more prominent, he begged the Sacred College to desist from the idea of electing him, and each time his voice trembled, his face was troubled, and the tears flowed from his eyes. Sometimes he went into details to explain how lacking he was in the gifts required for the Papacy. Yet it was these very appeals of his, instinct as they were with profound humility and wisdom, which raised him in the estimation of the Sacred College.

Gibbons, who had great faith in the persuasive powers of Cardinal Satolli, implored him to plead with the Patriarch of Venice. "Cardinal Sarto must be made to accept. He must not be allowed to refuse. Impress upon him with all the force of that eloquence which you possess that he is the choice of his colleagues; that God's will is being manifested through them; that he must accept the sacrifice, take up the burden, and God will give him the necessary strength to guide the bark of Peter." And so it was that Cardinal Sarto was induced, through the insistence of an American Cardinal, to accept the election "as a cross." Five days later, after the coronation ceremonies, Cardinal Gibbons succeeded in getting Pope Pius

X to receive a group of American pilgrims, his first audience as Pope. It is said that shortly before his death, the last group of pilgrims received by him were also from America.

Indeed, America has many reasons to be grateful to Pope Pius X. During his pontificate of eleven years, seventy Americans received episcopal appointments. Two Apostolic Delegates to the United States served under his guidance, Cardinals Falconio and Bonzano. One of his first state papers was a brief issued in behalf of the Catholic University of America. In his letter, *Lamentabili*, dated June 7, 1912, and addressed to the bishops of Latin America, Pius X defended the South American Indians of Peru. He entrusted Cardinal O'Connell with a delicate mission to Japan. He approved the formation of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America (Maryknoll). And he received the Society of the Atonement (Graymoor, N. Y.) into the Church.

FRUITFUL PONTIFICATE

During the eleven years of his pontificate, "one of the most fruitful in the history of the Church," Pius X issued or supervised publication of 3,322 documents, of which more than 350 were encyclicals, letters, *Motu proprio* and addresses. Among the important documents were: the encyclical *Instaurare omnia in Christo* (restoration of all things in Christ); decree *Motu proprio* (on church

music); encyclical *Acerbo nimis* (teaching of Christian Doctrine); encyclical *Il fermo proposito* (on Catholic Action); decree on frequent reception of Communion; encyclical *Pascendi* (against Modernism); decree on early reception of Holy Communion by children; encyclical *Vehe-menter nos* (French Separation Law); and the apostolic letter on reorganization of the Curia and revision of Canon Law.

"Together in one—all things in Christ!" These were his last words on the morning of August 20, 1914, when Pope Pius X—"The Holy Pope"—rendered his gentle soul to his Maker. At the age of 79, overwork and anxiety over the onset of World War I weakened his physical resistance and he fell victim to an attack of influenza. In his will, which directed that he be buried in the crypt of St. Peter's and the body be not embalmed, he stated: "I was born poor, I have lived poor and I die poor." That he died rich in the virtues that make a saint is the opinion of all who knew him.

As early as 1923, the enquiry into the life and virtues of this Servant of God began. In February, 1943, the first step in his Cause for Beatification was taken when Pope Pius XII signed the necessary decree. In June, 1944, the ceremonies of identification in connection with the Cause were held, and the body, on public view in the Chapel of the Relics, in St. Peter's

Basilica, was viewed by many Allied troops visiting in Rome. From there it was transported to the Basilica Grotto, but removed temporarily in March, 1945, to a specially prepared niche in the Basilica's Presentation Chapel. This move was necessary because of extensive remodeling work in the crypt. The Archbishop and priests of the Archdiocese of Boston provided the silver casket in which the remains of Pius X will be permanently interred in the crypt.

In November, 1949, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, leading a pilgrimage from the U. S. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, presented His Holiness, Pope Pius XII a spiritual bouquet for Pius X's speedy beatification. It consisted of 157,758,175 good works pledged by 22 million American Catholics. And on August 8, 1950, the heroism of his virtues were formally proclaimed. In October, 1950, Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara, of Kansas City, Mo., and Bishop Matthew F. Brady, of Manchester, N. H., led a group of pilgrims from America to the birthplace of Pius X in Riese. The house is well preserved by the municipality, and a museum of Pius X has been erected there, and a huge monument to his memory. On March 5, 1951, the final decree "tuto" (safe to proceed) in the Cause was issued, and the date of June 3, the anniversary of the saintly Pontiff's baptism, was chosen for the beatification ceremonies.

at Latin School in the neighboring city of Castelfranco. Here he showed evidence of extraordinary intellectual talents, high moral character and solid piety. Each day he would walk the three miles to school, with only a piece of bread or corn-cake in his pocket. A typical peasant boy, he traveled most of the journey barefoot. In September, 1850, young Joseph Sarto entered the seminary at Padua, taking advantage of a scholarship. He attracted the attention of his superiors by winning first honors in his class.

When the young seminarian was seventeen, his father died, a heavy blow to the large family. But Joseph's mother insisted that he continue at the seminary. And there he stayed, excelling in all his studies, until his ordination on September 18, 1858, in the cathedral at Castelfranco. Father Sarto's first appointment was as a curate, at Tombolo, where he served under the wise guidance of Archpriest Antonio Constantini. The old priest, after observing the labors of Father Sarto, wrote these prophetic lines:

They have sent me as curate a young priest with orders to mould him to the duties of a pastor; in fact, however, the contrary is true. He is so zealous, so full of good sense and other precious gifts that it is I who can learn much from him. Some day or other he will wear the mitre; of that I am sure. After that—who knows?

Following eight years work in the

Tombolo parish, Father Sarto, then 32, was appointed in 1867 to be Archpriest of Salzano, one of the most favored parishes in the Diocese of Treviso. Here he again distinguished himself by his devoted care for souls, taking particular care with the teaching of catechism and delivering his sermons. While here he helped to improve the temporal condition of his parishioners by opening a free night school, co-operative associations and rural banks. Nine years later Bishop Zinelli rewarded his faithful labors by naming him canon of the Cathedral at Treviso. He was also appointed chancellor of the diocese, and served as spiritual director of the seminary.

CONSECRATED BISHOP

When the Diocese of Mantua became vacant, Pope Leo XIII, in November, 1884 named Canon Sarto to fill the difficult post. Consecrated on November 16, 1884, Bishop Sarto entered into Mantua in April of the following year. Conditions in the diocese had defied the efforts of two of his immediate predecessors. Hostile political forces had hampered the work of the Church there. The priests were poor and negligent. He immediately set to work on his seminary, taught several subjects there and gave the future priests his devoted attention. In his first pastoral letter to his flock he stated: "I shall spare myself neither care, nor labor, nor vigils for

the salvation of souls. My hope is in Christ. . . . Although I know that I am not sufficient for the burden, my strength is in Him."

Peace and order soon reigned and Bishop Sarto's reputation for zeal, piety and prudence in the government of his diocese received wide notice. Revival of catechetical instruction for young and old was soon brought about with the establishment of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in every parish, by sermons and lectures on the Bible. To aid his poor, it is said that he would pawn his silver, his watch, even his robes. Nine years as "Apostle of Mantua" brought him the praise of Pope Leo XIII. "We congratulate you, Our beloved son, who has guided so worthily the Church of Mantua—truly a good shepherd of the people." On June 12, 1893, Pope Leo XIII created Bishop Sarto a Cardinal and three days later named him Patriarch of Venice. For the first two years of his service the civil government refused to recognize the appointment, since it had not been consulted.

When he entered his patriarchal city, on November 24, 1894, he received a hearty welcome from his people. His work at Mantua, his kindness and geniality, his ceaseless work for the spiritual and social needs of the souls under his care were well known. Pleased with his appointment, the Venetians presented him with a beautiful and richly decorated gon-

dola. For ten years as Patriarch of Venice, Cardinal Sarto continued to be the zealous shepherd of his flock and instituted many projects for their benefit. Humility, wisdom and holiness marked his every endeavor.

One contemporary characterized him at this period as "the social-political Cardinal, the benefactor of the individual poor, a successful intermediary between employer and the employe in their disagreements . . . he vanquished the extreme and revolutionary elements in politics and religion."

Ever interested in the struggling Catholic press, he many times rendered financial assistance. On one such occasion he declared that he would rather pawn his crozier and his purple than see a paper go out of existence. He managed with great tact to keep up friendly relations with the State officials, without compromising his position. As Patriarch of Venice he won for himself the love of the faithful and the respect of his opponents.

ELECTED POPE

On July 20, 1903, the great Pope Leo XIII died, and the Cardinals hastened to Rome for the Conclave to elect his successor. On July 26, Cardinal Sarto waved good-bye to his people as he boarded a train, with a return ticket in his pocket; so sure was he that he would soon return to them and his many projects in Ven-

ice. A few days later, August 4, 1903, he was elected Pope.

It was Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, first American cardinal to attend a Papal conclave, who greatly influenced this selection. Commenting on Cardinal Sarto's persistent desire not to be considered as a candidate for election, he relates:

At every scrutiny, seeing his name become more and more prominent, he begged the Sacred College to desist from the idea of electing him, and each time his voice trembled, his face was troubled, and the tears flowed from his eyes. Sometimes he went into details to explain how lacking he was in the gifts required for the Papacy. Yet it was these very appeals of his, instinct as they were with profound humility and wisdom, which raised him in the estimation of the Sacred College.

Gibbons, who had great faith in the persuasive powers of Cardinal Satolli, implored him to plead with the Patriarch of Venice. "Cardinal Sarto must be made to accept. He must not be allowed to refuse. Impress upon him with all the force of that eloquence which you possess that he is the choice of his colleagues; that God's will is being manifested through them; that he must accept the sacrifice, take up the burden, and God will give him the necessary strength to guide the bark of Peter." And so it was that Cardinal Sarto was induced, through the insistence of an American Cardinal, to accept the election "as a cross." Five days later, after the coronation ceremonies, Cardinal Gibbons succeeded in getting Pope Pius

X to receive a group of American pilgrims, his first audience as Pope. It is said that shortly before his death, the last group of pilgrims received by him were also from America.

Indeed, America has many reasons to be grateful to Pope Pius X. During his pontificate of eleven years, seventy Americans received episcopal appointments. Two Apostolic Delegates to the United States served under his guidance, Cardinals Falconio and Bonzano. One of his first state papers was a brief issued in behalf of the Catholic University of America. In his letter, *Lamentabili*, dated June 7, 1912, and addressed to the bishops of Latin America, Pius X defended the South American Indians of Peru. He entrusted Cardinal O'Connell with a delicate mission to Japan. He approved the formation of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America (Maryknoll). And he received the Society of the Atonement (Graymoor, N. Y.) into the Church.

FRUITFUL PONTIFICATE

During the eleven years of his pontificate, "one of the most fruitful in the history of the Church," Pius X issued or supervised publication of 3,322 documents, of which more than 350 were encyclicals, letters, *Motu proprio* and addresses. Among the important documents were: the encyclical *Instaurare omnia in Christo* (restoration of all things in Christ); decree *Motu proprio* (on church

music); encyclical *Acerbo nimis* (teaching of Christian Doctrine); encyclical *Il fermo proposito* (on Catholic Action); decree on frequent reception of Communion; encyclical *Pascendi* (against Modernism); decree on early reception of Holy Communion by children; encyclical *Vehe[m]enter nos* (French Separation Law); and the apostolic letter on reorganization of the Curia and revision of Canon Law.

"Together in one—all things in Christ!" These were his last words on the morning of August 20, 1914, when Pope Pius X—"The Holy Pope"—rendered his gentle soul to his Maker. At the age of 79, overwork and anxiety over the onset of World War I weakened his physical resistance and he fell victim to an attack of influenza. In his will, which directed that he be buried in the crypt of St. Peter's and the body be not embalmed, he stated: "I was born poor, I have lived poor and I die poor." That he died rich in the virtues that make a saint is the opinion of all who knew him.

As early as 1923, the enquiry into the life and virtues of this Servant of God began. In February, 1943, the first step in his Cause for Beatification was taken when Pope Pius XII signed the necessary decree. In June, 1944, the ceremonies of identification in connection with the Cause were held, and the body, on public view in the Chapel of the Relics, in St. Peter's

Basilica, was viewed by many Allied troops visiting in Rome. From there it was transported to the Basilica Grotto, but removed temporarily in March, 1945, to a specially prepared niche in the Basilica's Presentation Chapel. This move was necessary because of extensive remodeling work in the crypt. The Archbishop and priests of the Archdiocese of Boston provided the silver casket in which the remains of Pius X will be permanently interred in the crypt.

In November, 1949, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, leading a pilgrimage from the U. S. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, presented His Holiness, Pope Pius XII a spiritual bouquet for Pius X's speedy beatification. It consisted of 157,758,175 good works pledged by 22 million American Catholics. And on August 8, 1950, the heroism of his virtues were formally proclaimed. In October, 1950, Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara, of Kansas City, Mo., and Bishop Matthew F. Brady, of Manchester, N. H., led a group of pilgrims from America to the birthplace of Pius X in Riese. The house is well preserved by the municipality, and a museum of Pius X has been erected there, and a huge monument to his memory. On March 5, 1951, the final decree "tuto" (safe to proceed) in the Cause was issued, and the date of June 3, the anniversary of the saintly Pontiff's baptism, was chosen for the beatification ceremonies.

Civil Authority

MARK J. FITZGERALD, C.S.C.

Sermon delivered November 16, 1952 at Sacred Heart Church,

Notre Dame, Ind.

FOR a truly Christian attitude toward civil authority much can be gained in noting the example set by St. Thomas More, once Lord Chancellor of England. Ever mindful that civil authority comes from God, More would never sanction its use to thwart God's will or His justice. St. Thomas More did not hesitate to go to his death rather than approve an invasion of the spiritual power by the state.

Towards the end of his life, the King's henchmen desperately sought some pretext to discredit the retired chancellor. At last they found a case by which they hoped to prove him a corrupt public official. The charge was presented to the King's Council that More had accepted a gold cup from the wife of a Mr. Vaughan, in whose favor More had decided a claim. Readily More acknowledged the gift, a New Year's present some time after the decision. Exultingly his accuser cried out: "Did I not tell you, my lords, that you would find the matter true!" But after an eloquent pause, More made a laughing-stock of his accuser by adding that upon

receiving the gift he had hustled his butler off for wine to fill it; that More and Mrs. Vaughan had pledged each other's health and then,—that he had given her back the cup as a New Year's present to her husband.

Regrettably enough, even in some respected groups, the notion is entertained today that civil authority is necessary only because men are sinners, that in a nation free of immoral men, or in a society of saints, conscience alone, without the aid of human legislation, could insure perfect harmony and justice. Such a belief—that the fall of man provided an accidental basis for civil authority—ignores the universal teaching of the Church that the state is founded on the order of creation, and is itself a basic element of natural law.

Even the saints do not think as one. A temporal society composed exclusively of the sanctified would still need a civil authority to coordinate and direct the efforts of its citizens towards the common good. By the very fact that God has endowed men with individual personalities, buttressed with sacred rights and du-

ties, the state becomes a natural necessity and must be fortified by authority adequate for its purpose. In a word, Catholic teaching holds that civil authority is derived from the social nature of man, and is thus ultimately founded on God, the supreme Authority of the universe.

FALSE DOCTRINES

The final purpose of the state is to serve the common good so that the community, the nation, the world, with the help of grace, will provide an open way to eternal salvation beyond. In our day, the Church warns us, we face two great forces which oppose Catholic doctrine on civil authority by making it appear that freedom and authority are irreconcilable. Thus, individualism seeks to belittle and undermine the civil power in order to turn freedom into license. At the other extreme totalitarianism distorts the proper role of government by holding that the state is its own source of authority and has no obligation to a Higher Power or to its subjects.

On the assumption that the state is a necessary evil, individualism would relegate the state's functions to a merely negative role of keeping the peace. A positive program of social legislation to extend opportunities for the exercise of man's natural rights is opposed as an unwarranted extension of civil authority. In answer to this stand of individualism

the Popes speak with praise of social legislation which seeks to protect the "family, homes, workshops, wages and labor hazards" of citizens in modern society. The Church sees in these measures a better ordering of community life toward its ultimate goal of providing a path to eternal salvation.

Now Pius XI has pointed out that individualism is actually the parent of the other great threat to civil authority, totalitarianism. The egotistic doctrine that man is a law unto himself has now been transferred to the state. By distorting his place in creation the extreme individualist has given rise to the monster state, which declares war on God, violates the dignity of the human person and reduces authority to mere force.

Once God is denied as the source of civil authority, the state inevitably takes upon itself the autonomy proper to God alone, and regards itself as the ultimate end of life, the supreme arbiter of right and wrong. Like individualists, the advocates of the all-powerful state scorn the doctrine that man is naturally destined to live in society so that he may develop his faculties in order to glorify God, perform his duties and thus attain eternal salvation. Like individualism, the totalitarian state denies the right of the Church to pass judgment on moral issues involving the civil power.

In your future lives as business-men, lawyers, or public officials, how

may the civil authority touch you personally? Let us consider one area of application. In our time a vast region of civil authority is delegated to administrative boards on the supposition that they will exercise it prudently, in keeping with public policies and for the achievement of public purposes. Unfortunately, a few men, Catholics among others, either as members of such agencies or as parties appearing before them, have lost sight of their grave responsibility to the public interest. They have sought to frustrate or distort civil authority to suit their own private interests.

It rests on you to be wary of the man-traps which lie in wait to destroy the integrity of public officials and of private citizens petitioning them. As a member of an administrative board, never allow yourself to give short

weight to the public interest out of deference to a former employer in private life, or in the hope that such a breach of trust may later gain you an attractive position with a concern whose cause here and now you are bound to judge impartially. Avoid as a plague undue association with representatives of organizations which are affected by your decisions. Need it be added that salaries, fees, or speculative gains should not be accepted by a public official from parties covered by his judgments? Even the inexpensive gift has been found to be a subtle means of impairing an official's ability to exercise civil authority objectively.

May all of you, as custodians or petitioners of civil authority, be worthy disciples of St. Thomas More, whose last words on the scaffold are recorded: "The King's good servant, but God's first."



Gambling in the U. S. A.

In Kefauver's *Crime in America* it is reported that illegal gambling has become a \$25-billion-a-year racket. In the amounts bet the total far exceeds the amount spent last year for clothing and shoes, which ran a bad second at \$20 billion. According to the Internal Revenue office there were 18,913 professed gamblers in the United States in 1951, and the tax yield for a full year on their operations amounts to about \$8 million—a mere pittance compared to the returns in the illegal rackets. This social cancer on the body politic becomes the more dangerous when we realize that it is just a surface manifestation of an over-all corruption. On every page in Kefauver's report we find the byproducts of gambling—perjury, murder, bribery, extortion, smuggling, kidnaping and white slavery.—*Monsignor John Cavanagh in THE REGISTER, Denver, Colo., Nov. 23, 1952.*

Social Attitudes of the French Hierarchy

JEAN VILLAIN, S.J.

Director, Action Populaire, Vanves, Seine, France

*Reprinted from SOCIAL ORDER**

IN THE CRISES which conditions I brought about during the post-war years, the French hierarchy has taken the opportunity to recall some large ideas of Catholic social teaching. I shall indicate the general spirit of their statements and discuss some of the lines of development they have suggested.

Their core idea has always been that of Leo XIII and Pius XI: ameliorating the lot of the proletariat. That problem in France is extremely complex. Three aspects are of particular significance for this study:

1. The living of wage-earners, especially those with families, is poor, hazardous and even miserable. Often it is below a normal 20th-century standard.

2. The wage-earning class, kept in a state of economic dependence, is seeking to secure some just share in the political and economic guidance of its country. This is the problem of worker "enfranchisement."

3. The working class, with some regional exceptions, has become de-

Christianized and looks upon the Church as the enemy of workers and the ally of capitalism.

Moreover, as Rev. M. R. Loew, O. P., one of the most zealous social apostles in France, has testified, these problems cannot be solved separately. Economic structures must be changed if the total condition of man is to be improved. Hence, the considerations of the hierarchy and the work of the Church have kept constantly united the two-fold activity of social teaching and religious apostolate: they seek the *integral* good of the proletariat.

Adequately to present the social teachings of the French hierarchy, it would be necessary to examine both their statements on social questions and the new directions which they have given to the ordinary apostolate of the Church since the Liberation. Since this would require too lengthy a presentation, our attention will be concentrated exclusively upon the statements of the French hierarchy since the Liberation.¹

¹ Most of the 94 French bishops have contributed to Catholic social teaching; we shall

* 3655 West Pine Blvd., St. Louis 6, Mo., June, 1951.

Moved by conditions among workers, the French hierarchy naturally turned to an examination of the socio-economic regime which exists in France at the present time. Thus, in February, 1945, the Assembly of the Cardinals and Archbishops² of France condemned "the scandal of conditions among the proletariat . . . which deprive many workers of any life that could be called truly human."

CRITICISM OF CAPITALISM

"In union with the Popes," the Assembly continues, "we condemn in the capitalist system its emphasis upon money, which makes the effort for profit more important than care for the human person of the workers. Business, altogether too often, has become an undertaking directed to private interests when it should be a service for the community." The A. C. A. also condemned: 1) the disorder of a society in which we see "financial powers able to dominate both private and public economy and often even the activity of the state, and the countless mass of those who, instead of experiencing some assurance in their private lives, lose all interest in true and high spiritual values and cut themselves off from aspirations toward a liberty worthy of that

name" (Pius XII, September, 1944); 2) everything in modern economic society which tends to foster the struggle of one group against another, all of whom, while they have different and divergent interests, are, nevertheless, united among themselves by common, essential interests and ought to strive for the common good of their profession; and finally 3) the materialist doctrines which have sacrificed the rights of human beings, called to the dignity of sons of God and brothers of Christ, to a soulless competition and the thirst for gold.

These condemnations are a continuation of those of Leo XIII and Pius XI, in which they vigorously protested against the same disorders at earlier stages of their development.

This is the tenor of many statements by French bishops. Cardinal Suhard, for instance, returned to these points in his pastoral on property. It will suffice to indicate just one more manifestation of this thought, one taken from a particularly important document, the letter written on September 8, 1949, by the A. C. A., making application of the decree of the Holy Office on Communism. Concerning modern capitalism *as it exists in France*,³ the Cardinals declare that "in the very notion

consider only their more significant documents. Among these are included the declarations of the Assembly of Cardinals and Archbishops of France, which meets semi-annually, and the celebrated pastorals of Cardinal Suhard.

² Hereafter referred to as A.C.A.

³ We emphasize the words "as it exists in France." It is clear that insofar as abstract

of capitalism, that is to say, in the absolute value which it gives to property, without consideration of the common good and of the dignity of work, there is a materialism condemned by Christian teaching."

WAIRS AGAINST COMMUNISM

But as capitalism declines in France, there seems at first glance to be only one doctrine, one movement which stands as a successor. This is Communism. Should Christians then turn towards Communism as an alternative? Here the French episcopate is clear in its unanimity. Again with Popes Pius XI and Pius XII the episcopate vigorously condemns Communist doctrine and warns the faithful against its influence.

This warning was made particularly effective in 1947 in a remarkable letter of the Archbishop of Aix-en-Provence, Msgr. de Provenchères. Earlier, in 1945, in his pastoral letter on property, Cardinal Suhard had shown both the weakness and the danger of Communism. Communism, which

professes to be a movement for the liberation of the proletariat, . . . cannot be a suitable remedy for the social disorder of today. It will not free the proletariat. It will use them in bringing about the economic transformation of the world; and all that it promises them, on that far-off day when the long-awaited paradise is established upon the earth, is the

enjoyment of the material fruits of this transformation. That is all. Is that enough? No, this is not enough. Communism forgets that man is above all a spirit and made to go to God, . . . because its atheistic materialism will not permit any recognition of such a vocation for man and that is why it leaves no place for spiritual values or for religion. The Church . . . loves its children too much to permit them to undertake an adventure destined from the very beginning to failure because it does violence to the nature and destiny of man.

It was necessary for the French episcopacy to adopt a vigorous attitude against Communism at that time particularly because of the increasing activity of the French Communist Party. French Catholics were constantly being invited to collaborate closely with the Communists, in a more or less official capacity, in their struggle against injustice. Moreover, this invitation was very attractive to all of those who were oppressed by the socio-economic conditions of the time.

The question of the association of Catholics with Communists was further complicated because of peculiar social conditions in France. Un-critical opposition to all Communist efforts could be a source of danger for religion. The Archbishop of Aix saw this clearly four years earlier. He distinguished in Communism, over and above its doctrine, a whole group of practical attitudes, an eco-

capitalism is concerned, that which is described in the third part of *Quadragesimo Anno*, they are in agreement with Pius XI in saying "this system is not intrinsically evil."

nomic theory and finally "a movement which wishes to take over the ambitions of the worker class and which would become the worker party, the only party of the workers."

As a result of this, the Archbishop notes, a serious difficulty arises. A systematic and unconditional opposition to the Communist movement runs the risk of making Catholics appear as enemies of the worker class and might drive the workers further from the Church. For this reason Msgr. de Provenchères warned the faithful that they must be on their guard lest opposition to Communism make them appear to oppose the workers' desire for freedom and justice and improved living conditions.

This brief remark makes clear the delicate position with respect to Communism of Catholics who were deeply engaged in social action for apostolic reasons. It was inevitable that some who were placed in this difficult position should have made mistakes. This was the case, particularly, with the movement of "Christian Progressivists" who, especially at the beginning of their movement, undertook to unite their political action closely with the activities of the Communist Party, believing that they could separate the atheism which Communism professed—and which they unquestionably rejected—from the political and social action of the Party, which they sought to promote.

The principal bishops of France, supported by all of their colleagues, have condemned this attitude of the Christian Progressivists in carefully formulated statements. The most emphatic of these warnings came from Cardinals Liénart and Suhard. The latter was particularly emphatic in his warning that by following such a line of conduct, a Catholic

takes the chance of being taken in, even without realizing it, by the principles of a doctrine which the Church has condemned and of contributing by his effort to the success of the Communist Party. For the triumph of the Communist Party will inevitably result in a loss for the faith of God, and unjust restriction of the liberty of the Church in France and reliance upon totalitarian political methods. Many recent examples, which the Communists themselves do not deny, make it impossible to doubt this. No Catholic should be compelled to reproach himself for having given his support to the establishment of a regime which brings with it such injustices.

But the Cardinal also insisted that while it was impossible for the Church to permit Catholics to enter into "a close and habitual collaboration" with the Communist Party, circumstances could arise in which Catholics would be led "to undertake their action parallel to that of the Communists in seeking limited and precise objectives required by the general interest, without any essential union with the special objectives of the Communist Party." The same opinion was expressed by

the Cardinals of France in their letter of 1949 already mentioned.

Thus far we have considered nothing except condemnations. The Church of France has condemned modern capitalism. It has absolutely rejected Communism. But in the present disorder, what directions has it given to consciences which turn to it for guidance?

Two questions confronted the bishops: 1) Within the framework of the present socio-economic order, how could injustices be brought to an end? 2) How, in what direction and in what spirit, would it be possible to change the present framework in order to effect a true improvement of worker conditions?

TEACHING ON WAGES

In the present order four problems above all call for the attention of the hierarchy: 1) wages, 2) strikes, 3) trade unionism and 4) private property.

1. *Wages.* During the past six years, there have been many periods of strikes in France, all of them brought about by low wages. Many bishops, during this time, reviewed the teaching of the Church upon wages, applying and developing it in accordance with actual conditions of French

society. In these statements the French hierarchy has given a living example of what is the Church's social teaching, namely, an appeal to principles which is also as precise as possible an application of these principles to the needs of each period and country. There results a constant development in the teaching and policy which shows the realism of the Church and its great desire to help humanity advance constantly and with assurance towards its end.

This has been true particularly of the question of wages. Since the time of Leo XIII this problem has developed considerably and is presented today in quite different language than in 1891. There has been an extremely interesting doctrinal development these past sixty years.

The most striking statement on wages during 1947 was that of one of the youngest bishops of France, a man already renowned for his doctrinal strength and for his profound understanding of social problems, Msgr. Ancel, Auxiliary Bishop at Lyons for Cardinal Gerlier and Superior General of the priests of Prado.⁴

In a letter he summed up in brief, expressive language the doctrine of Leo XIII. Independently of the cur-

⁴ The Prado is a society of priests founded at Lyons about 100 years ago by the venerable Father Chevrier. It is characterized by a spirit of great poverty. Since Msgr. Ancel became Superior General, the society has spread to a large number of French dioceses where it has organized priest-teams in the most de-Christianized regions and those which have been most deprived of priests.

rent difficulties in France, he stated the strict, natural right of the worker to a living wage:

I do not know what it is in terms of money, but the right to a living wage is a strict right.

The worker cannot renounce this right. If he is forced by necessity or fear of some greater evil to accept a lower wage, then he is the victim of unjust exploitation. And this should be known.

Having called attention to this principle, the Bishop went on to consider how it should be applied in the present circumstances.

He begins by stating that it is not within the competence of a churchman to show how the worker is to be given a living wage, and he adds: "I do not say that wages should be increased. I am neither an economist nor a financier. I say the worker should have a living wage." Furthermore, he undertook something beyond the scope of Leo's work in attempting to consider the problem of wages on the social level. He knew well that in 1947 wage stabilization resulted from a number of factors which were beyond the control of an individual employer or even of an entire industry. As a result, it was difficult to point out where responsibility lay, so greatly was it spread out among a large number of individual and moral persons. For this reason, he concluded with these frequently-cited words:

I do not say that the employers are guilty. Many of them submit, despite themselves, to a fearful economic compulsion. I do not wish to determine responsibility. But it is not right that we should bow passively in the face of injustice. A land in which workers do not receive a living wage is in the state of sin. The problem before us is not merely one of employers and employees. It is the whole nation which must feel its responsibility to re-establish justice.

This letter of Msgr. Ancel was frequently referred to at later times, especially during the strikes of the Winter of 1950. At that time, at least thirty bishops stated their position in letters or addresses. This is a considerable number if one realizes that many of the French dioceses are rural and were not affected by the strikes.

But, as a result of social structures and actual conditions in France, the bishops were compelled to go beyond the individualist point of view of the living wage. In France the problem of wages is no longer settled merely by signing contracts between individual employers and their employes. The problem is dominated above all by the idea of a division of the entire national revenue among the different social classes of the nation (capitalists, farmers, wage-earners, civil servants and pensioners) to such a degree that to increase the wages of workers would be to increase the proportion of the national income distributed to wage-earners.

Under these circumstances, if one wanted to be sure that everyone

would receive at least a living wage, it would be necessary to give some attention, at least in theory, to the problem of the distribution of national income. Without entering into technical questions, many bishops have been impelled to throw some light upon the morality of certain aspects of this distribution.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

With regard to the distribution itself two questions presented themselves to the bishops:

First of all, what portion of the national income should be distributed immediately to different groups of consumers and what portion should be invested?

The bishops recognized the obvious necessity of investments, even of large investments. But what proportion and under what conditions? It was the Bishop of Marseilles, Msgr. Delay, who presented an answer to this question:

There is a great deal of talk about the necessity of large investments for replacing material, for repairing war damages and preparing for the future. This is perfectly evident. But should not a Christian recognize that the human ought to have precedence over the material and that the portion of returns destined for investments should be subordinated to the antecedent payments of suitable salary for workers.

This reply is all the more effective because it can be asked whether at certain times in France the portion

of income destined for immediate consumption has not been too greatly reduced, especially when the difficulties and competitions of international trade are taken into account. Before giving thought to the superfluities of future generations, we should make certain that the present generation does not lack for necessities. If there had been more respect given to this principle in France during the past six years, not only would the demands of social justice have been better met, but there would have developed a favorable spirit for an increase in productivity, which would undoubtedly have given new impetus to our exports and permitted even considerably larger investments than those which were actually made.

But even after it has been decided what portion of the national income will be given for immediate distribution, there remains the question of how much will be distributed to each of the different classes of consumers. On this point, the bishops have given no attention to many difficult and technical questions, as, for instance, that of taxes, but have attempted to determine the principle which should regulate the distribution between capital and labor at the base, that is, in the individual business.

In our capitalist regime, work is remunerated by wages and capital by profit. Cardinal Liénart points out that "profit cannot be legitimately

sought except in the second place, and never to the detriment of the subsistence of workers," and Cardinal Roques, Archbishop of Rennes, states that if profit is legitimate it is on condition that it does not "do harm to the just demands of labor" and the first demand is for a family living wage.

Even when the portion of national income to be given to wage-earners has been determined, there still remains the question of how much of this is to be distributed to the different classes of wage-earners. This is the complex and controversial question of the scale of wages.

But, in 1950, maintaining the scale which had been in effect made it difficult to maintain a living wage for all workers. Many employers who were quite willing to increase the wages of workers receiving less than a living wage stated that they were prevented from doing this because they were compelled to maintain the scale of wages, *i.e.*, the relation between wages paid to different types of workers.

In the face of this situation, the bishops stated first of all that in our capitalist system "a scale of wages is necessary and must be preserved"; it is in harmony with the principles of the present economy and its appropriateness cannot be questioned, since it undoubtedly fosters the development of the economy. But in the difficult conditions which have just

been discussed, many bishops declared that if maintaining the present scale of wages presents an obstacle to raising abnormally low wages, the scale should be relaxed as much as is necessary to permit fulfillment of the essential right of all workers to a living wage.

"Social peace," states Cardinal Liénart, "cannot be secured except through a sincere spirit of solidarity among all the members of industrial society, even though it requires certain sacrifices." And by their remarks concerning the relaxation of the scale of wages, the bishops have again pointed out the significance of the principle of a living wage.

The French bishops, going gradually beyond the previous teachings of the Church, have considered the problem of wages from various points of view. In the future, wages will more and more be a question of the distribution of national income, a distribution which is conformed to social justice, always being sure to respect the principle of payment of a living wage to those least favored. This distribution is not a passing problem generated by the present crisis. The bishops are also interested in the long-range aspects of the problem because of the question of investments. As a result the question of wages has gradually developed since the time of Leo XIII from an individual matter into a social and international problem.

2. *Strikes.* The number of social conflicts naturally made it necessary for the French bishops to repeat and clarify the classic doctrine about the "just strike." Many of them have restated the traditional doctrine that there are just and even necessary strikes. As a result of present conditions, they have emphasized the following points:

DOCTRINE ON STRIKES

Use of the Strike. In his statement of November 24, 1950, Cardinal Suhard recalled that "it is not permitted to use the strike unjustly or inconsiderately. For a strike is a dangerous weapon. Moreover, it should not be employed except as a last resort."

Hence, if it is unfortunately correct to say that circumstances and even the existence of modern capitalism make the strike an almost unavoidable evil today, the Church asks, nevertheless, that every effort be made to render resort to a strike as rare as possible, not by legal prohibitions, but by removing its causes.

Peaceful Measures. But even when these efforts have been made, there will still be conflicts between employers and employees. In 1950, the bishops recalled that to improve conditions without a strike, it will help if peaceful measures of resolving conflicts are developed. Among these would be conciliation and arbitration, which were used successfully in

France before the war. By this statement, the bishops recall an important declaration made by the A.C.A. in 1934.

The Justice of Strikes. The bishops do not comment upon the principles of moral theology regulating strikes. But some manifest a tendency no longer to consider a strike merely by itself, but to place it in the context of the entire labor movement from which it derives its morality. Cardinal Suhard does not hesitate to state that "100 years of history make it clear to us that the strike is often the only effective weapon for workers by which they can achieve their just demands." And in March, 1950, speaking of the number of strikes at that time, the Bishop of Nice wrote: "The strike today is just."

On the face of it, this last statement seems astonishing. It is evident to anyone who has the least bit of information that if a criterion of the just strike is applied to some hundred strikes that are going on at one time, a large number of them will immediately be seen to be just. Some of them will appear to be unjust. But, for a large number of them a moralist will not be able to express a judgment, since he does not have the details which only an expert would have about the causes of the strike.

Nevertheless, this statement made by the Bishop of Nice is extremely

important and merits consideration. Concerning it, a writer in the *Revue de l'Action Populaire* in May, 1950, observed:

The statement is not concerned with any single strike but with the entire movement which has sprung up among the workers as a means to secure legitimate demands which the government and employers have refused even to consider for many months. This development of strikes cannot be properly judged except in the context of the entire labor movement as it has grown and developed during the past 150 years. In this movement, the strike has been used successively in a series of ways which are all part of one entire action. In this historical development some of the strikes will appear to have been unfortunate and even regrettable, it is true. But it should not be forgotten that without recourse to a strike the worker class would never have secured many of the advantages which it enjoys today.

Under these circumstances, in using the only effective weapon at its disposal, the worker movement is doing nothing else than using the right of legitimate defense against a system which oppresses it heavily. Hence, to pass judgment on a series of strikes, it is not sufficient to consider it by itself; it must be considered in the totality of the labor movement with which it is inseparably bound.

These are the considerations, it seems to us, which make it correct to say that the strike of last Winter was just, inasmuch as it was a reaction of the worker class against serious abuses which it cannot otherwise remove. Certain actions taken in the course of this just defense of rights may have been unfortunate or even faulty. Nevertheless, the

totality of the strike movement does not for that reason seem to have been less just.

The Political Strike. Every strike today has some causes and some results which are political, but the "political strike" seems to us to be one which is directly undertaken and carried on for political ends. On this subject, the hierarchy stated clearly in October, 1948, and the A.C.A. declared in particular: "While the strike is a right guaranteed by the Constitution, . . . it may not be used for political objectives." The A.C.A. immediately adds that any use of the strike which would result in harm to the nation or damage to the authority of the state is wrong. By this statement they recognize that, in addition to directly political strikes, there are two other kinds whose use is wrong because they are incompatible with the necessities of social life: a) those which involve very heavy damage to the country or to a large group of citizens; b) those which involve the cessation of operations that seriously impede government.

On this point, the bishops are in agreement with our most discerning jurists and far in advance of Parliament which, during the past six years, has not made the slightest attempt to regulate the use of strikes.

3. Trade Unionism. To improve wages and to secure other just demands, workers must be united in strong unions. The question of unions

in France is not the same as it is in the United States. For historical reasons, too detailed to discuss here, Catholic workers have been urged, in conformity with *Rerum Novarum*, to join Christian unions. These unions are not dependent upon the Church, nor does their membership include only Catholics. The C.F.T.C. (Confederation of French Christian Workers) has been in existence for about thirty years, and its unions are entirely independent of any clerical influence in temporal affairs. Moreover, they invite as members all men of good-will who, whatever be their religious faith, accept Christian social doctrine as the basis of union activity. As a result, there are in the C.F.T.C. Protestants, Orthodox Catholics, Moslems—and even atheists, as well as Catholics. But the national officers of the C.F.T.C. (at the present time, they are M. Gaston Tessier, president, and M. Maurice Bouladoux, secretary-general) have always been excellent Catholics.

In 1925, a letter of the Congregation of the Council to Msgr. Liénart, Bishop of Lille, strongly urged Catholics to join these unions. After the Liberation in 1944, conditions made it uncertain what course was to be followed. Workers could be urged to join the C.F.T.C., which was being reorganized (all trade-unions had been suppressed during the Occupation), or they could be directed to join neutral unions. This latter

would have the advantage of achieving worker solidarity and giving Catholic workers an opportunity to exercise a beneficial influence upon the entire labor movement.

In 1945, with the encouragement of Rome, the A.C.A. stated that "freedom, with respect to different beliefs and plurality of organizations, can work against the tendency to monopoly which could become totalitarian." They informed all Catholics "that their place was emphatically in the Christian unions, which were both *bona fide* and inspired by Christian moral principles and the social doctrine of the Church." At the same time, the A.C.A. recalled a suggestion made in a letter of 1929 that the Christian unions could enter temporary agreements with other groups to achieve joint objectives.

CHRISTIAN TRADE UNIONS ARE INDEPENDENT

It will perhaps be necessary to explain a few details about Christian trade unions for American readers. They are not weak organizations, dominated by pastors and bishops. As the A.C.A. stated, they are true unions, "professional and free," carrying on their union activities completely independent of the Church. Actually, in their ideas and methods they resemble the large American Federations, AFL and CIO, more than do the other French groups, the C.G.T. and even the C.G.T.-F.O.,

which are Communist and Socialist politically and often anti-clerical.

In 1948, the A.C.A. again spoke of the C.F.T.C.: "We assure the C.F.T.C. that it has our complete confidence. We are convinced that the Christian unions are the normal way for Catholics to assure a just defense of their interests and rights as workers and the way to bring the social morality of Christianity to bear upon all their activities." Here we find the two motives which inspire the position of the hierarchy: Christian unions do the trade-union job well, and they manifest to all men the social teaching of the Church, by demonstrating both its existence and its strength.

PRIVATE PROPERTY

4. Property. The A.C.A. restated traditional ideas on property in its declaration of February 28, 1945. It demands "that each worker gradually secure some private property by a policy of just wages, and the establishment of conditions of life that will permit him to develop his personality and to improve his family in a home which is worthy, healthy and corresponding to his needs. Private property is one of the natural rights of the human person and an important condition for his full development." Connected with this passage, to which all of the bishops of France gave their approval, is the letter of Cardinal Suhard on the

teaching of the Church about private property, which was issued a short time earlier.

The importance of this letter and its courage appear when we realize the change which the idea of private property had undergone in the minds of many French Catholics. Unconscious heirs of the French Revolution and its liberalism, these Catholics tended to see no more in property than an individual and absolute right which had no reference to the common good. This is an egoistic principle and all the more anti-social because for those who accept it, the right of private property extends in exactly the same way to all kinds of goods, both large productive goods and consumer goods. "What I possess, I possess for myself," is the practical and universal principle of this liberalism.

Pope Pius XII, in two well-known addresses (June, 1941, and September, 1944,) had vigorously attacked this idea. He restated the truth that "all men by their nature have the fundamental right to use the material goods of the earth." However sacred this right may be, it is subordinate to the natural and universal end of material goods. Considered from the social point of view, this right is a means to an end. Considered thus, the right takes on an entirely new aspect: charity has replaced egoism.

Completely in accord with the

Sovereign Pontiff, Cardinal Suhard begins by recalling that "the Church defends the right of property for all," and he analyzes the personal and familial foundation of this right. "Property," he concludes, "a stable, personal and familial right to consumer goods and to some means of production, is indispensable for the human person. Everyone has this right . . . by his very nature, that is to say, from God, his Creator. Man can only lose this right by ceasing to be man."

When this idea is thoroughly understood, we can see the serious disorder of our present socio-economic regime which, as a matter of fact, reserves to a small number of men access to private property. Consequently, the misery and insecurity of the proletariat constitutes, as Cardinal Suhard writes, "an inhuman and unjust condition." He concludes his letter by restating the thought of Pius XII in strong language: "*No more a proletariat; everyone a property owner:*" this motto well understood should be the program of those who wish to rebuild society on truly human and Christian foundations." And it will be no triumph for individualism if property is thus widely distributed because, continues the Cardinal, in Christian thought: "He who possesses, possesses for all, ought to possess his property for all, and can possess it for all with the Grace of God."

This remark is particularly applic-

able to the means of production. "The common good demands that private ownership (of productive goods) be recognized as the best means of assuring that the goods destined for all be placed at the service of all in a manner worthy of man." Hence the formula "He who possesses, possesses for all," is at the same time an affirmation and a declaration of an obligation. It is an affirmation that private property has as its purpose to place at the service of all the goods which are intended for all. It is an obligation inasmuch as the owner is compelled to use his right for the good of all. Having reviewed and restated these general principles, the Cardinal states that whoever compares this doctrine with the abuses of modern capitalism must conclude that "*a change is necessary.*"

And not merely a change of some details, a patching-up of economic organization. We must look to vast changes in the organization itself. Instead of the capitalist regime in which production subordinates man to its service, there must be substituted an economy which in the future will exist for the service of man and for all men. But if this change is to be effective, the transformation of institutions must be accompanied by a renewal of souls, by a true revolution "which will remove hatred and egotism." This is "the revolution of love."

I hope that all educated Catholics will have an opportunity to read this

instructive and inspiring letter of Cardinal Suhard on property. If they put its teachings into practice, there will quickly be considerable change in the world.

This discussion leads us naturally to a consideration of the thought of the French hierarchy about reform of socio-economic society.

FRENCH HIERARCHY AND REFORM OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ORDER

No subject has interested the French hierarchy during the past six years more than this one.

It is evident that the present social order, inasmuch as it keeps in existence the state of the proletariat, is opposed to the development and even the maintenance of Christian life in the masses of the people. Consequently, we must look for some reforms which will foster the relief and emancipation of the proletariat, while respecting the present needs of civilization and the psychology of people.

Immediately after the Liberation, in 1944 and 1945, the French hierarchy took positions on this question which have not been changed since that time.

Cardinal Suhard was the first to consider this subject, in a letter dated December 2, 1944. The Cardinal insists that it is not enough merely to "place the relations of those who contribute to production—capital, managers and workers—on a new basis.

The reform must genuinely integrate the masses into society by giving them a totally new share in responsibilities."

Then he adds this strong statement: "The Church has no fear either of words or of realities, for the simple reason that it is always well disposed toward anything which will help the masses of the people to achieve a more human life. And, since the proletariat is the direct result of the capitalist system, how is it possible not to desire the transformation of this unfortunate system if one truly desires to make the proletariat disappear?"

Cardinal Suhard returned to this same thought in February, 1945, in his pastoral letter on property, and the A.C.A. discussed the question again a short time later. The A.C.A. asked

for progressive organization of work, of business, of the industry and of society. A worker wants to feel at home in work; he wants more human work in which he will be able to contribute his sense of responsibility as a man and his good will with courage, attention and conscientiousness—all his activity. He desires to share in the social and economic life of the business as well as in the profits of production. On the other hand, the working class intends to take its legitimate share of its responsibility for the well being of the business and of the entire nation. To achieve this social progress reforms of society are necessary: we are ready to welcome them.

However, the hierarchy declared emphatically that it had no desire to

make a statement about alternative systems. Adopting an expression of Pius XI, they state "simply but emphatically the principle of an objective more and more clearly pointed toward a contract of society."

Seeking concrete objectives is the work of the laity. It is their duty to reorganize society in a manner most favorable to the moral and religious life of citizens. This effort to change institutions they should exercise in conformity with the requirements of their Christian faith as Christians, but in their individual, personal capacity, so as not to inject the Church into the affair or compromise it in matters which are not its domain.

In 1944, Cardinal Suhard declared that "research toward and the actual achievement of the reforms of organization which will achieve the deproletarization of the masses of the people is a *grave duty* at the present time. . . . The Church calls upon all who by their ability, their social duties or their professional activities are able to assume some responsibility in the work of discovering and achieving new social structures."

Moreover, he considers it as normal that wage-earners should bring about reforms which will free them from their "state of dependence." "The wage contract pure and simple is just, but it should be free; no one has the right to impose it upon others who do not wish to enter into it. New solutions must then be sought with a

generous and prudent boldness." In other words, adopting the suggestions of Pius XII, made in September, 1944, Cardinal Suhard asks that at least in every large business the means should be discovered for "modifying the contract of work by a social contract."

But the reform of economic order should go beyond the level of the individual business to the entire industry. Here we shall be brief because on the question of professional organization, the French hierarchy has been very clear, without adding anything essentially new to what had been stated before the last war. They seek "the establishment of a vocational order which will help to make all the elements of an industry—employers, office workers, wage-earners—members of a human community in that industry united in order, justice and brotherhood." And, like the Popes, they wish that this professional organization be built up little by little by those who are connected with each industry under the control of the public authority and not all at once by the dictatorial authority of the state. They see plant councils, joint commissions and associations as the point of departure. These should gradually bring both employers and workers into increasingly frequent mutual contact, which will bring about loyal collaboration.

Anyone who has followed the teaching of the French hierarchy during the past six years will be impressed

with its realism. They have not been content merely to repeat eternal principles. Interested in real problems, they have attempted to apply the doctrine of the Church to the current needs of our country. Moreover, they

have done all this with a strictly apostolic purpose—to make socio-economic life as much oriented as possible under the circumstances to the spiritual good of men and to the glory of God.



Confused Catholics

If a builder tries to place a fine superstructure on a faulty foundation, the building will eventually collapse. We must build our spiritual lives on a firm base, brick by brick, of natural virtues. Only when this is done can we safely establish a supernatural framework. Unless this is done we fall into a state of confusion. The number of confused Catholics is one of the tragedies our day. Like so many modern Americans, they are trying to get something for nothing and, failing, they become critical and bitter. No one will ever climb to the heights of sanctity without paying the full price in "blood, sweat and tears." Too many of us want the joy of the Resurrection without the pain of the Passion. No wonder we become confused.—*Anne Tansey in the MAGNIFICAT, Manchester, N. H., October, 1952.*



Attention Mr. Blanshard

U. S. Air Force transports were used last fall to fly 3763 stranded Arabs on a religious pilgrimage to Mecca. The U. S. planes carried the Moslems 800 miles from Beirut, Lebanon, to Jidda near Mecca. Shuttling back and forth the planes flew a total of more than 60,000 miles.

Thus an official U. S. government agency, at great expense to the taxpayer, cooperated directly with a religious organization in a religious function. This move made countless friends for the U. S. in the Moslem world.

So far, no peep has been heard from any of the usual sources about "violation of the principle of separation of Church and State"—the same ones which usually raise great alarm over a government bus picking up a few American parochial school children. How come?—*THE TIDINGS, Los Angeles, Calif., Sept. 19, 1952.*

Man and the Universe

JOHN STERNIC

*Lecturer in Astronomy,
Dearborn Observatory*

*Adapted from an address to the Woman's Club,
Deerfield, Ill., January 13, 1952.*

MAN stands halfway between the atom and the star. In a very special way he occupies the midpoint of creation since he is about as much greater in size than an atom as a star is greater than he. Is this just chance, or did the Creator mean for man to be so situated in order to look with equal ease and interest at the world beneath his feet and at the world beyond him?

What does man see from his position in the universe? If he looks toward the world of the microcosm, the world of the atom, he sees order, symmetry and law. He finds all things are built according to plan and follow laws which are beginning to be faintly understood. The 98 presently known atoms form the building blocks of all material substance. Atoms combine to make molecules, molecules combine to make substances and substances make up all the world of solid, liquid and gaseous matter.

When man looks into space, out into the world of the macrocosm, he sees vastness beyond comprehension, distances to make the mind reel and shudder. Out in this sea of vastness

he sees the same order, the same unfolding of processes according to plan which he saw down in the atom.

But men seldom look out into space and few men contemplate the atom with anything but confusion or fear. Our world of daily life goes on its geocentric way much as it did in days before Copernicus. For most of us the cares and burdens of our lives keep our thoughts close to the earth from which we draw our livelihood. The earth remains our *alpha* and *omega*. To our gaze the earth looks flat and endless. Out in the sky the sun and moon and stars wheel ceaselessly along their paths as they move around the earth. Oh sure, we know inside our minds that the earth is round, not flat; and that it, not the sun or stars, is moving, but this is mind-stuff. It does not make much difference in our lives. We creep about upon the earth and it remains for us the center of creation.

Yet this is not the way it should be. How can we understand the earth or its place in the plan of the universe if we never raise our eyes beyond our

planet? How can we ever sense the glory of God, who made the universe and all things in it, if we never think of anything but the cares and worries of the day? Lift up your head and raise your eyes to see the wonder of creation and of God. Come with us on a mental journey into space to see just what our place in this great universe may be.

Look first up at the moon, the nearest of celestial bodies. Its distance is a mere 238,000 miles or so; just across the alley so to speak. Shining by reflected sunlight it sends its rays of light down to us in just one-and-a-third seconds. It belongs to earth in a real sense, our circling satellite forever changing phases as it falls round the earth once each four weeks or so.

Beyond the moon lies *Mars*, the nearest of the outer planets. It comes within 35 million miles of the earth when it is nearest. From *Mars* the reddish beams of light, traveling 186,000 miles each second, need about 190 seconds ($3\frac{1}{8}$ minutes) to reach the earth.

The next in line is *Jupiter*, mightiest of the planets. Its average distance is about 480 million miles. From *Jupiter* light needs about 33 minutes to reach the earth.

And then come *Saturn*, *Uranus* and *Neptune* until we finally reach *Pluto*, the farthest planet known. *Pluto* is more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ billion miles away; $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours by light-time.

Pluto marks the present boundary of the solar system, the system of the

sun and planets. Beyond it lie countless miles of almost empty space, the realm of distant stars. Project your mind out through it until you reach the nearest visible star, *Alpha Centauri*. Its distance of some 26 trillion miles is so tremendous that light, speedy though it is, needs $4\frac{1}{3}$ years to each us. Reflect on this a moment— $5\frac{1}{2}$ hours to the farthest edge of the Solar System and $4\frac{1}{3}$ years to the nearest star beyond. Here is one measure of our smallness.

100 BILLION STARS

But space goes on and on out into the heart of the galaxy of which our sun and planets are a part; a galaxy so huge that light requires 100,000 years to cross its full diameter. This is the realm of stars, about 100 billion of them, most of them greater than our sun. The mind can scarcely comprehend this without help, so let's consider it this way:

Suppose the solar system, with its radius of $3\frac{1}{2}$ billion miles, could be shrunk so small that it would fit within the palm of your hand. The sun would then be just a spark of light and the planets could not even be seen. On this same scale the galaxy of stars of which it is a part would be represented by the entire continent of North America!

And still this is not all. Beyond the edge of the galaxy lies really empty space, so far and wide that earthly measures have no meaning. Out in this emptiness lie other galaxies much

like our own; millions upon millions of them, each with its billions of stars. They are so far apart that light from the very nearest needs 700,000 years to reach us. This is the picture of Creation as the telescope reveals it, and even the great new 200-inch mirror on Mt. Palomar has seen no end to it.

Our minds have traveled far out from the earth. It is well that thoughts need no time to travel, else we could not even think our way out into the vast universe around us. Let us come back now, from galaxy to galaxy until we reach our own, and then down into it until we find our tiny sun, one of a hundred billion. We see our earth in true perspective now, a tiny grain of dust circling a spark of light.

HUMILITY, NOT HUMILIATION

And what of us who live upon this tiny earth? What does this make of us? Smaller than small are we, so utterly insignificant that we seem to crawl within ourselves. For those who understand all this there is no humor in the astronomer's answer to a question about what would happen were some future nuclear explosion to shatter the earth. He said: "What of it? It isn't as though the earth were a major planet." Our earth could burst asunder and the event would go unnoticed out in the galaxy since earth is ever hidden in the glare of the sun.

Be humble, man! We don't amount to much. Here is humility that one can really feel, but it is not humiliation, for man is more than dust.

Our mental journey into space shows us how small we are, but let us fast remember that while we need such physical perspective, we need philosophical perspective just as much. Our study of space can give us that as well, if we will remember that the mind of man can encompass the whole universe even if he understands it only feebly. Here is where man's value lies—in the value of his soul and mind, not in the worth of the dust of which his body is composed. And just as the mind of man reaches out across the emptiness of space in search of knowledge, so does his soul seek the Fountain of it all.

We did not just come to be, without a cause, and our great universe with all its galaxies needs a great Cause as well. If the universe is vast and wonderful, how much more wonderful the God who made it all. In truth, "The heavens declare the glory of the Lord." We can all do well to reflect on this from time to time so that we may find ourselves saying as Lincoln once did: "I can see how it might be possible to look down upon the earth and be an atheist, but I cannot conceive how any man could look into the heavens and say there is no God."

Is Communism the Enemy of Religion?

THE REV. EAMONN GAYNOR

*These remarks at a public debate in London, November 6, 1951, are reprinted from CHRISTUS REX.**

WHEN we want to find out the true Communist attitude to anything, I think it is only fair to consult their authorities. I would like you to do the same with regard to Catholic teaching. After all, an individual Catholic or Communist might not understand his creed sufficiently well to be able to give a true picture of it. Alternatively, he might have some reason, best known to himself, for concealing part of it, for putting one off the scent. And so, in all fairness, I shall see what Marx, Lenin, Stalin and the other accepted authorities have got to say on religion. I would remind you first of all the motion is: "That Communism is not the enemy of religion": that you have come here to find out what chance you, who believe in God, no matter in what way, would have in the perfect Communist society, and how you would be treated once the Communists took over your country and began to press for the realization of their ideal.

"Atheism is a natural and inseparable part of Marxism, of the theory and practice of scientific socialism."

That is not my idea about Communism. No, these are the very opening words of the official publication, *Lenin on Religion*. You notice, "natural and inseparable"—you can't have one without the other, no more than you can have a cup of tea without tea. You can't imagine Marxism without atheism. But let us see what some more of the authorities have got to say. Listen to Marx, the man who started it all: "Communism abolishes eternal truths" (and belief in God is one of these), it abolishes all religion and all morality . . ."¹ And if you turn to Soviet Russia, admittedly nearest the Communist ideal, but not quite arrived there yet, you will find that, while there are still traces of religion, the good work of eliminating them is being zealously pushed ahead. Here is what the official League of Youth publication, *The Young Bolshevik*, had to say in August, 1948:

One can encounter among our young

¹Marx, *Capital*, p. 341, The Modern Library, 1932

* St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland, October, 1952

men and women many backward elements who are still influenced by religious doctrine. Leaders of the Communist League of Youth must not maintain an unscientific reactionary ideology. It precludes conscientious citizenship of the Soviet State. In order to attain the complete victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R., the Soviet youth must maintain an indifferent attitude towards religion. Members of the League have no right to consider religion their private business. Religion is incompatible with membership of the League.

Again I would like to remind you that that is not my idea about Communism: it is the idea of those who should best understand it. And so, if a Communist should still say to me that Communism is not the enemy of religion, my reply would be, either that he does not understand his Communism, or else he is deceiving me.

Now, you might think it preposterous that I should accuse anybody of deceiving me—after all, the ordinary man has a conscience about such things; he has some idea that there is a commandment against telling lies, and he doesn't like to be told that he is going against his conscience. But a Communist, a good one, that is, is unhampered by any such conscience. For him right and wrong is simply a question of what serves his cause or what does not. If to lie helped Communism, it would be right; if it injured it, it would be

wrong. If I were a Communist and wanted to induce religious people to help me, I would deny that these quotations existed, if I thought I could get away with that: or else I would try to twist their meaning so as to make them less offensive. If I balked at doing that because of any scruples of conscience, it would simply mean that my conversion to Communism was not yet complete.

COMMUNIST MORALITY

Lenin says that Communists deny all morality in the "sense which deduces these morals from God's commandments."² He states: "We say our morality is wholly subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. We deduce our morality from the facts and needs of the class struggle of the proletariat."³ They make it up as they go along. If it suits to be unjust, to maltreat, to persecute, all is right. If it suits to tell lies, then it becomes a duty to do so. Here is the advice Lenin gives to Communists when he tells them they must get into the trade unions. Party members should, "if need be, resort to all sorts of devices, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade unions and to remain in them and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs."⁴ If a Communist says to me, therefore, that

²Lenin on Religion, p. 55, Little Lenin Library, Vol. 7, Lawrence and Wishart, Ltd., 1947 reprint.

³*Id.*, p. 56.

⁴Lenin, Left Wing Communism, p. 38, Lawrence and Wishart, Little Lenin Library, 1934.

Communism is not against religion, can you wonder if I suspect him of "evasion and subterfuge" in order to win my support?

MUST FIGHT RELIGION

But let us see some more Communist views on this question of religion. Let us see what the Communist Party must do about religion, not when it is still struggling towards its goal, but when it has taken control of a country. Remember that the Party is now virtually the state, and that now it can use the power of the state to further its ambitions. Is it content to be a government, as near atheist as possible, but unwilling to interfere with religion, preferring to let it die of itself? That might be acceptable enough. But immediately all the authorities laugh at such an idea. They lay it down that it is the duty of the Party to fight actively against religion, until it is completely wiped out, and that the Party is failing down on the job if it fails to do that. "The fight against religion, the opium of the people, occupies an important place among the tasks of the cultural revolution. This fight must be carried on persistently and systematically." "Persistently and systematically," using, of course, all the means at the state's disposal. This is stated in the program of the Communist International, which was adopted by

the Sixth World Congress in 1928. Again we find a publication of the British Communist Party saying: "It is essential at the present time to wage, with the utmost vigor, the war against religious prejudices."⁵

But at this stage all Communists are warned to go very carefully lest their efforts have the opposite effect to those intended. They must not declare war openly on religion. Lenin says that Engels was highly critical of the methods of the Blanquists: that he "described their noisy proclamation of war on religion as nonsense, and stated that such a declaration of war would be the best means of reviving interest in religion, and of preventing it from dying out."⁶ Of course, we couldn't agree with him more closely. No, the Communist must be more subtle. He must not be an all-out anarchist, but must watch for his opportunity, and take it when it comes. "He must always be able to determine the boundary between anarchism and opportunity," says Lenin.⁷ A good way of doing this would be, for instance, to put priests in jail for criminal offences—that would be persecuting crime, not religion, and would have an even better effect.

It is, therefore, the duty of every Communist Party to carry on a persistent and systematic war against religion, but in a veiled way. It is

⁵ABC of Communism, p. 264, 1922.

⁶Lenin on Religion, p. 16.

⁷Id., p. 21.

recognized that sometimes it is better not to carry out these duties all at once. Sometimes it is wiser to put some of the policies into "cold-storage" for the time being, lest they result in loss of support. "When forces are inadequate, detours, waiting periods, zig-zags, retreats and so on and so forth may be necessary."⁸

COLD STORAGE STRATEGY

"Waiting periods, retreats"—a good example of this tactic was the present Hungarian Government's policy towards Catholic schools. All Communist authorities agree that it is imperative to get full control of the schools. And yet the Catholic schools in Hungary were allowed to carry on for some years after the establishment of a Communist Government there; even as late as February, 1948, the Minister of Education publicly commended these schools for their work. Here, it seemed, was a departure from normal Communist practice. But within a few months of this the Catholic schools had been taken over, because "their text-books were out of date."

The classic example of the "cold-storage" tactic is the Chinese Constitution, drawn up in 1934, for the day when China would be Communist-controlled. It was felt then, however, that this constitution, as it stood, would be too strong in the early years

of Communist domination, that the people must be "educated up to it." And so the present constitution was fashioned, one that very cleverly seems to contradict the real one in many ways, but never does so in actual fact. The preamble to the real one reads:

This Constitution can be given full virtue and effect only after the rule of Imperialism and the Kuomintang shall have been finally overthrown, and the Soviet Republic shall have established its power throughout all China. Then alone will the Constitution as hereby drawn up find more concrete application, and become, in all its detailed provisions, the Constitution of the Chinese Soviet Republic.

Such is the "cold storage" tactic. If at the present time the British Communist Party seems to be neglecting its duty of fighting religion, you are not to be misled by that into thinking that, after all, Communism is favorable towards religion. British Communists have never retracted any of the official views on the matter; they have simply put them into "cold storage." Ten years ago the Communist Parties of Hungary and the other countries were likewise silent, but now they are pushing forward. Let us see what progress they have made.

The survey must necessarily be brief, but it should nevertheless be enlightening. We will expect to find a policy designed to weaken religion,

⁸Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XII, p. 20, Russian ed., and *Readings in Leninism*, Vol. IV, p. 57, Lawrence and Wishart.

while, as far as possible, not seeming to do so. We will in fact find two things. First, that the Party recognizes that the Church must be allowed to survive for the present, but that it must be strictly controlled and used for political purposes when it can be of assistance. And secondly, that the Party has taken over all the normal means of spreading ideas, uses them for disseminating atheistic Communism, and effectively silences any effort the Church might make to counteract these ideas.

NATIONAL CHURCH

In all Communist countries an energetic effort is made to make the Church completely national. Ministries of Religion are set up. (In Russia the Minister concerned is a well-known atheist.) An endeavor is made to send away all foreign missionaries. Catholic priests are put under pressure, by enticements and threats together, to break with the Pope, so that the Church can be controlled from within the country. I will not try to show you tonight how harmful national churches are to religion. But Communists, at least, should understand when I say the policy is just as weakening to religion as Titoism is to Communism.

With the Church more or less under state control, the state can proceed to use it for political purposes.

You will find in the various Church-State agreements an insistence on the Church supporting the peace movement, condemning the warmongers, etc. (And, of course, we all know who the "warmongers" are.) How can a priest support the "peace movement" if he knows it is a trick to weaken the Western nations? How can the Church lend its weight, if it feels about it as Stalin does—that it is a piece of political strategy? "The signing of the Brest-Litovsk peace may be taken as a model of this strategy," he says, "for it enabled the Party to gain time, to take advantage of the conflicts in the camp of the Imperialists to demoralize the forces of the enemy . . . and to accumulate forces in preparation for the offensive."⁹ Isn't this using the Church for political ends? Won't it undermine the influence of the Church, in as much as people will come to suspect it of teaching, not what God, but what the state wants?

So the "fight" goes on, an insidious undermining of the authority of the Church. But we will see more. At this stage I could so easily bring to your notice some of the hundreds of eye-witness accounts we have of persecution of religion in Communist countries—but I know the cry would go up: "lies, filthy lies." It is easy to shout "lies," especially if you believe you must put your cause before

⁹Stalin, *Problems in Leninism*, p. 268. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1939. See also, Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII, p. 7, Russian ed.

even the truth; but I will try to base my case, nevertheless, not on these accounts, but on the various agreements the churches have been maneuvered into signing with their governments in these countries.

A condition for Church survival seems to be that the priests get the people to obey the state in everything, that they refrain from "stirring up anti-state feeling" in their sermons, and that the Bishop remove any priest who does so. That on the face of it looks to be a perfectly praiseworthy policy for the Church. But look at the dilemma in which a priest in a Communist country finds himself. He must tell people to obey, in every respect, a state pledged to the ultimate destruction of all religion. He can't criticize Communism, which is an enemy of religion, because he would arouse "anti-state feeling." Thus the Church loses one of its greatest weapons in fighting atheistic Communism—the preaching of her priests. Again this is not fighting religion "openly."

The Communist governments have effectively silenced the two other great means of counteracting atheism, the Church schools and the press. They make sure to capture the schools early on in their regime. They insist that all teachers be trained in "modern thought," which of course is Communist thought; preference is given to teachers favoring Marxism; text-books are given the Communist

slant. Even if we did not know that, we might have guessed it anyway, because such is the duty of a Communist government. On the other hand, Catholic schools are all taken over, and are put on the same level as the others. And teachers in all schools are forbidden to teach religion.

CONTROL OF THE PRESS

Communist governments have also taken complete control of the press. Papers in these countries all the time carry vicious attacks on bishops and priests and on the Pope, and denounce them, not on religious, but on criminal grounds. And no paper is allowed to reply to these attacks. In Hungary, for instance, all Catholic papers, except one, are banned. The survivor is a weekly, and in 1948 Cardinal Mindszenty complained to an English news reporter that that was in fact Communist-controlled. The government regulated the supply of newsprint, and anyway the compositors at the printing-works were all Communist, and only printed what they liked. Isn't it a strange thing that a "Catholic paper" should never have a word to say in defence of its bishops and priests? Isn't it stranger still that that paper never mentioned the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty? A clause in the Chinese Constitution, that is borrowed by many of the others, throws much light on this matter. It says that "anti-religious

propaganda" will be allowed. But there is no mention of religious propaganda, and that cannot be presumed, because a Constitution usually says what it means, and no more.

LIQUIDATING THE CLERGY

We come to the final Communist-tactic I am going to mention—the liquidation of all "reactionary" clergy. With the signing of the Church-State agreements, this tactic has become much simpler. Formerly it was necessary to stage a trial to get these men out of the way. Now the bishop must remove any priest who is guilty of "stirring up anti-state feeling," and it is so much easier that way. So we find nowadays that there are fewer such "trials" than in the earlier years.

I read in the *Daily Worker* the other day that all priests in jail at the present are there for collaborating with the Nazis during the war. Well, it's easy to brand an unknown man, hundreds of miles away, a Nazi, if we have not questioning minds. But is it likely that so many priests should be Nazis, when their Pope spoke out so often and so strongly against Nazism? When so many of their bishops (to mention but two, Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac) were interned by the Nazis? When so many of their brother-priests were killed by them, or maltreated, or imprisoned? Anybody who would believe that "ex-

planation" knows nothing about Catholic priests. Anyway, if the Communists are so zealous about punishing ex-Nazis, why don't they punish people like Vilmos Olti, who was Cardinal Mindszenty's judge, and who was one of the leaders of the Hungarian pro-Nazi movement during the war? Or, perhaps his conscience is not softened enough—yet—to bring him to "confess" his crimes, like all the others. It may be, some day, and then we can look forward to one more of those famous "confessions."

It was not possible to brand Cardinal Mindszenty as a Nazi, because he had been interned by them, and anyway his judge had been one. But the Communists did concoct charges of spying for the Americans, plotting to restore the monarchy and breaking the currency regulations. The whole non-Communist world believes still that these "charges" are false; that the "confession" was extorted by means of the nerve-destroying "arcetrol"; that his confession was repudiated by him beforehand, and that he was got rid of because he opposed the taking over of Catholic schools.

So far, the Communists have given no convincing proof that everything was right at the trial. A few weeks ago, some English clergymen visited Hungary and brought back the wonderful news that they were "satisfied" that everything was fair at the

trial, and that the Cardinal was punished because he was a criminal. Of course, it does them credit to accept the Communists' word so easily. But do they not realize that they are taking the word of a government that is not living up to its beliefs unless it is expert in the art of deceit and guile? Would they be satisfied if, for instance, Mr. Churchill were to publicly indict one of themselves on criminal grounds and, even before they were arrested or tried, were to declare them guilty and announce that they would be given "exemplary punishment"? If all the newspapers for months beforehand were to say the same thing, and during the trial lay down what punishment they should get, would they be "satisfied"? Wouldn't they bring a libel action against the Prime Minister and the newspapers and demand a re-trial?

Yet all this, and more, happened in Hungary, and still the word of a Communist government can satisfy them! If they wanted to be satisfied, why did they not go to see the Cardinal? After all, he confessed to his crimes, and pleaded for exemplary punishment and surely, all they have to do now is to speak to the man, and be re-assured by him that the reports of his trial were all a lie. But until they can do that, we will not be

satisfied, especially when we remember what Stalin said about priests who were awkward to the regime: "The party cannot be neutral . . . towards the reactionary clergy who poison the minds of the toiling masses. Have we suppressed the reactionary clergy? Yes we have." (Can we imagine dear Uncle Joe neglecting his duty?) "The unfortunate thing is that it has not been completely liquidated . . ."¹⁰

But my argument does not depend on what we can see through the odd cracks in the Iron Curtain, although we can see some horrible things at times. We have come here tonight to find out whether Communism is or is not the enemy of religion, and to find out as a result whether or not we who believe in God can support Communism in any way. I am asking you to accept the words of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin (and the Pope if you like, for they all agree on this, at least), that Communism is utterly incompatible with religion; that every Communist has the duty to fight against religion, using any tactics he can get away with: that if he fails to carry on that fight, he is not a good Communist, and had better be careful. Stalin again has said that "cases occur when certain members of the Party hamper the complete development of anti-re-

¹⁰Stalin, *Leninism*, pp. 386, 387, Co-Operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the U.S.S.R., 1934.

ligious propaganda. If such members were expelled, it is a good thing, because there is no room for such 'Communists' in the ranks of the

Party." And so I say to any Communist who does not fight religion—watch out for yourself at the next Party purge.



"L'Europe Vaticane"

There are two reasons in particular why it is odd that such currency should have been gained, not only for the notion that the Holy See is actively promoting the "Little Federation" (The Schuman Plan countries), but also for the view that it is the joint creation of the Christian Democratic parties in the West European countries, which the Holy See has been able to use as its agencies. In the first place, the Christian Democratic parties in all these countries have lost no opportunity since the war to insist that they are not confessional parties at all, and therefore certainly not the exponents of any "Vatican" policy. Germany is the only one of the countries concerned where there are in fact any large numbers of Protestant members of the Christian Democratic Party, but even in Holland, where separate parties for Catholics and Protestants remain, the confessional test of membership in the Catholic party has been removed; while in Belgium the word *Chrétien* was introduced into the title of the party associated with this very broad classification, in place of the word *Catholique*.

Moreover, of all the schools of party-political thought in Europe, it is precisely the Christian Democrats who since the war have made the least attempt to organize themselves internationally. Those gathering in Strasbourg for the Congress of the Liberal International could have reflected that there are corresponding annual Congresses for the Socialists and the Communists, co-ordinating their common action, but none for the Christian parties. The reasons for this are many, and important among them is the varying nature of the parties, which are too easily assimilated politically, on the ground that they all profess Christian foundations, by people who do not reflect that there are wide contrasts in their programs and policies. The parties referred to in Holland and Belgium, for example, are conservative in character while MRP in France, to which belongs the chief architect of the alleged Vatican Europe, likes to regard itself as more comparable to the Labor Party in Britain.—THE TABLET, London, England, Oct. 4, 1952.

Radio Writers Off the Beam

HARRY GERSH and PAUL R. MILTON

*Reprinted from the NEW LEADER**

LAST November, a dissident group in a small union took a licking in the union's annual elections. The union: Radio Writers Guild. The group: "We the Undersigned," an anti-Communist caucus.

There's nothing newsworthy about an anti-administration group within a union losing an election—even when that group calls itself anti-Communist. But in the context of 1952—from Korea to the CIO house-cleaning—the RWG vote deserves inspection.

By a 2½-to-1 margin, Guild members decided to endorse persons who have, on more than one occasion, opposed resolutions condemning world Communism and who continue insisting that Communism is an irrelevant issue in a radio writers' union. This union is a component of the Authors League of America, Inc., as are the Dramatists, Authors and Screen Writers Guilds. RWG has a national membership of about 1,100 and represents the writers of most of the news, documentary, dramatic and comedy material on the air over the four major networks. RWG members

operate under industry-wide agreements with broadcast employers; to work in network radio, writers must belong to RWG; many also now write for television, though that field is not yet organized.

"We the Undersigned" (WTU) had been decisively defeated in 1950 and 1951, but most of the caucus members were shocked at last month's result. This article is an examination by two supporters of "We the Undersigned" into some of the reasons for this seeming paradox of a union membership preponderantly anti-Communist failing to elect an anti-Communist administration.

First, the background: until August, 1950, most RWG members gave little thought to Communism in the union. The word was rarely mentioned at meetings and, if it was, it evoked a tangible atmosphere of pious horror. But that August, Welbourn Kelley, veteran union officer and councilman, proposed in council a resolution backing the United States in the then three-month-old Korean war. The cat popped out of the bag with a most unpious scream. A majority of the

*7 E. 15th St., New York 3, N. Y., Dec. 8, 1952

council opposed the resolution—similar to those adopted by hundreds of other unions—at which point Kelley and Daisy Amoury resigned from the council and took their case to the membership. The reason given by the RWG administration for killing Kelley's resolution—or any variant thereof—was that it was "political."

The resignations of Kelly and Amoury were very shortly followed by that of Erik Barnouw, long a devoted RWG worker, and the formation of the "We the Undersigned," caucus. Anti-Communist candidates were nominated and the mimeo machines oiled. RWG members began to learn of the jungle war that had seethed under cover for years between anti-Communists and others who could never be described as Stalin-haters.

Members also heard how the leadership group had opposed certification of the union under Taft-Hartley—even though that might have meant losing the then-pending industry-wide contract which was the sole reason for RWG's existence. The suspicion grew that while many persons might oppose Taft-Hartley for many reasons, the reason here was a reluctance on the part of some Guildsmen to sign the non-Communist oath.

In spite of these emerging facts, the leadership group asserted its claim to be self-sacrificing devotees of "labor" and, in the election of

1950, "We the Undersigned" candidates were soundly defeated. In 1951, the fight was milder and the result was almost the same, though, by a quirk, David Driscoll of the anti-Communist slate squeaked in as an alternate councilman, and Erik Barnouw as RWG delegate to the parent Authors League Council.

REFUSED TO OPPOSE COMMUNISM

Meanwhile, the leadership group, proclaiming itself "liberal," still refused to oppose Communism and openly and uncritically defended anybody who might be charged with Communism.

For example, in early 1951, Sam Moore, past national president, past Western-region vice president and an Eastern councilman at the time, was named as a Communist by screen director Edward Dmytryk before the House Un-American Activities Committee. On the stand, Moore was shown a Communist Party card bearing a signature allegedly his, but took refuge in the Fifth Amendment; he did likewise on other questions bearing on Communist activity (*Communist Infiltration of Hollywood Motion Picture Industry, Part 2*, HUAAC). On returning to New York from his committee appearance, Moore got star billing at an RWG membership meeting. Since then, Moore has been named as a Communist by two other ex-Communists, Owen Vinsen and Paul Marion.

After the Moore incident, the RWG leadership adopted a policy promising to "defend, not judge" any members in trouble over Communism—a plain attempt to paralyze the judgment of individual cases, hardly an acceptable premise in a nation built on the concept of free, individual opinion and responsibility, or in a union of writers.

Partly as a result of that policy, which was adopted at a small membership meeting, most of the RWG members in Chicago quit RWG for another union.

STRIKEBREAKING

Other disturbing activities of RWG leadership included the support of scabbing and strikebreaking against the Screen Writers Guild in its strike against TV film producers (the Screen Writers routed its Communist element five years ago), as well as efforts to take RWG out of the Authors League and form a dual union, Television Writers of America.

The history of the anti-Communist minority since its first meeting is in the now classic tradition of liberal and conservative opposition in tainted organizations. First, strong expressions of horror, resolution and fight. Second, the disappearance of most of the caucus members after vocal and even financial expressions. Third, two months of feverish activity by a handful. Fourth, defeat at the polls.

Fifth, ten months later, repeat the whole process. That's how three elections in RWG have been lost. The *why's* are more difficult.

The first two elections—1950 and 1951—were marked by pussyfooting on both sides. WTU included writers of every possible political philosophy above pro-Communist, ranging from those who considered McCarthy a solid citizen to those far left of the *New Leader*. Their only amalgam was anti-Communism in RWG. Campaign literature in those two campaigns spoke vaguely of the dangers of Communism to America and to unions. No persons were named—except the candidates—and all WTU said was: don't vote for them. This appeal wasn't enough.

After the 1951 election, WTU dematerialized as usual. It held but one meeting between October, 1951 and September, 1952. In fact, the first meeting this year was called to consider dissolution of the group. That meeting was held shortly after publication of hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security at which five members of RWG had testified (*Subversive Infiltration of Radio, Television and the Entertainment Industry, Part I*, Senate Judiciary Committee). The witnesses included three "friendlies": Ruth Adams Knight, Welbourn Kelley and one of the writers of this report (Milton), all under subpoena. They told of penetration and control of RWG

by a discernible group pursuing policies helpful to the Communist conspiracy, going back to 1943. There were also two "unfriendly" witnesses, Peter Lyon and Millard Lampell, both of whom retreated far behind the Fifth Amendment on every question bearing on Communism and CP-ordered infiltration of RWG. Said the Senate Subcommittee in publishing the report:

Although a large majority of the membership of the Radio Writers Guild is anti-Communist, the Council of the Guild, which is the governing body, is controlled by the pro-Communist faction.

A fresh mandate was sought by WTU from those willing to appear publicly as anti-Communists and the 1952 RWG campaign started, this time wide open. "We the Undersigned's" literature now minced no words. Names of persons who had been named as Communists in sworn testimony (15), the Fifth Amendment group (4), and those with records of activity in front organizations, were published to the membership.

Some of the anti-Communists accepted the new tactics with glee; others did so reluctantly and only after much soul-searching. The RWG leadership reacted violently. Some honest liberals were scandalized. Result: the worst defeat yet for the anti-Communist group. And thirty-odd of us are now defendants in two libel suits brought by the new national

president, Hector Chevigny, and the new Eastern Vice President, Philo Higley, each for \$100,000.

Two QUESTIONS

This campaign and its results raise two questions:

1. What right does a union member have to remind fellow-members that candidates for union office have public records of connection with Communism?

2. Assuming, as we must, that most members of RWG are in fact anti-Communist, why do they support an administration which is not anti-Communist?

According to the soul-searching member of WTU, the right to name names is his as a citizen and as a good union man. He knows that Communism is his enemy as a free man and creative writer, and that Communist domination of a union is contrary to everything free trade unionism represents. Further, he has to name names because the membership gave little credence to the general statements issued formerly. In fact, not only more militant anti-Communists, but also the RWG leadership, insisted on "proof." Finally, since the media of mass communications have top priority in the Communist conspiracy, the problem becomes more urgent each day. Recent Party directives repeat long-standing instructions to use all cultural media in the service of the "line."

The second question is tougher: Why did the majority of RWG members voting support the administration slate? It might be because of WTU's poor group record of union activity in the past two years. Many of them have served as officers, councilmen, committeemen, but not recently. Most gave up in disgust; others who tried again felt so uncomfortable they bowed out. Since then, they've generally refused to support the administration or to be used as fig-leaves. (What? RWG Communist? Why, there's So-and-so right on such-and-such a committee!)

BAD POLITICS

This is not good politics. It is even doubtful unionism. Its only excuse is that it is human. The end result, however, was that the administration forces charged and proved that WTU supporters hadn't served RWG much in the past two years. That didn't help our cause.

Another reason for defeat may be that the evidences of Communist taint were not believed. If they weren't, then WTU is at a loss as to how further to document its charges. In one instance, three former Communists testified that one RWGer had been a cellmate of theirs. Although these facts were not denied, they seemed to produce not even a qualm. On the West coast, in the same election, one other person also named as being or having been a Communist

was elected to a council seat. Another is now facing deportation!

A sizable part of RWG is angrier at the people who are alarmed about Communism than at those who cause the alarm. At the election meeting in early November, member after member arose to castigate WTU for everything from "McCarthyism" to attempts to seize writing assignments. When a member of WTU asked, "Is our charge true? Do you deny it?" —the only answer was, "You have no right to ask."

Another explanation may be that many RWG members are afraid. If persons with records of positive activity in connection with Communism attract public attention, maybe later that attention will swing to include those who were only passive. Maybe, back on the Federal Writers Project, they belonged to the Unemployed Councils or to the Workers Alliance before or after it was taken over by the comrades; maybe, during the Spanish Civil War, they belonged to the Medical Bureau or some other aid group; maybe, during the last war, they sent an old overcoat to Stalin. Many of us on the anti-Communist side might have to plead guilty to such charges; the difference is that we would say so openly.

The problem of the anti-Communist everywhere in this respect is the same: how to reassure the person who may once have been "soft" on Communism during the Depression

or the war, who may once have given two dollars to an organization which was later seized by the Party—how to reassure them that their better course is not to fear their pasts, but to face them honestly and then go on to fight Communism.

One last reason for the defeat of WTU: the fight over Communism in the broadcasting industry is hardening. Public resentment against Communists and fronters in entertainment is swelling, and so is the reaction against it. Unfortunately, CP propaganda—confusing the legitimate documented exposure of our

country's enemies with reckless infringement on the rights of innocent individuals—has been effective in certain quarters. Many believe that any attack on Communists and their helpers is an attack on civil liberties.

The full meaning of the defeat of WTU is probably not yet clear, though the victors probably think it is. In any case, RWG has now said emphatically that it wants and approves a leadership which includes named Communists and which refuses to take sides in the fight against Communism. Obviously, the fight isn't over.

Basic Principle of Religious Unity

Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical letter, *The Fostering of True Religious Unity* (January 8, 1928), both cleared the ground of mistaken notions and put before the world the basic principle that the union of Christians can be effected only when those who are separated from the Church of Christ, which always has been and always will be one and visible as constituted by Him, are willing to accept in the fullness of faith the teaching and the sacraments and the authority of that one true Church. In our day there is a widespread desire among good men to secure the peace of the world and to promote the common welfare of human society by fostering among the nations of the earth that spirit of brotherhood which is founded in our common origin and nature. However good and praiseworthy these efforts may be in their own sphere, a grave mistake is made by many who, forgetting or ignoring the origin and the nature of Christianity, would endeavor to effect by like methods a vague sort of religious unity among men as a substitute for the one spiritual brotherhood in Christ that does and can exist only in the one Church founded by Him.—*J. I. Bergin, S.J., in CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART, January, 1953.*

Editorials

Secularism: The Common Danger

THE statement of the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches of Christ, following soon after the annual statement of the Catholic Bishops, invites comparison with the Catholic document.

While the sharp points of disagreement in the two statements were underscored by the secular press, the most noteworthy feature of the National Council's letter, to our mind, was the extent to which it agreed with the Bishop's statement.

The Bishops termed "secularism" the greatest threat to our nation. The National Council had some of its strongest and most effective statements on the same issue.

"The American tradition," the National Council stated, "recognizes in a multiplicity of ways that this nation exists and functions under God. The recognition of God which is written into the form and spirit of the American Republic constitutes an affirmation of faith in a Supreme Being who is the creator and father, the ruler and judge of man. He is the ground and sanction of human rights."

"The American state, far from

being indifferent or hostile to religion, has always recognized the indispensable service which it renders to mankind. In our country, religion and government have not been like contiguous squares, but rather like circles which intersect at two points. These points have been the reverent awareness of God, on the one hand, and the recognition of absolute moral values on the other.

"Inasmuch, therefore, as this nation was intended to be a religious nation, we should use all legitimate means to prevent it from becoming a secular state in the current sense of the term."

On other points, such as the need for religion influencing standards of conduct in public office, international efforts for peace, human rights, etc., the thoughts expressed by the National Council were quite in harmony with those expressed by the Bishops.

We are not drawing any wild conclusions from these observations. Catholics and Protestants are still light-years apart and viewing each other with intense suspicion. But it does seem safe to suggest that we Catholics may be taking the rantings of the Blanshard-Oxnam crowd a little too seriously. If their views had prevailed, the National Council's

statement would have named the Catholic Church as the chief menace to our society. Instead, more sober thinkers found themselves agreeing with the Catholic Bishops that secularism is our great common danger.
—INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD,
Indianapolis, Dec. 19, 1952.

The Obvious Choice

THE attention which this country's press gave to the very definite statement on August 28 by the Apostolic Delegate to Canada, Archbishop Ildebrando Antoniutti, that "people without land have the right to till land without people," has been a promising sign.

We have frequently emphasized the inescapable fact that our problems today must be faced boldly and met with a bold solution, or else the consequences will be as serious as the problem.

The time has passed when the free countries can look to their liberty as something that could be "bought" merely with part of their surplus wealth. Point-Four programs, Colombo plans, even certain forms of national or international charities are regarded as "sops" to keep the hungry and dispossessed moderately quiet, even if it is admitted that these will not keep them satisfied.

One of the most bitter criticisms levelled at North America by countries mobilized into the group of "free

countries" is that we are willing to share the burdens of defending our abundance, but are not willing to share our abundance. That makes them regard much of the military aid now being given in the form of arms or defense orders as equipment for our own defense rather than a manifestation of interest in our partners. Canada's action in sending equipment for an Italian division, while imposing a ban on Italian immigration (except for relatives), is a case in point.

The statement of the Delegate reiterated the incontrovertible moral aspects of the whole question of "international sharing." This must go far beyond the distribution of an excess share of our abundance, which is the apparent limitation of the Point-Four, Colombo and similar plans.

There is also a very practical aspect which must not be overlooked.

No class of people, no nation and no continent is in a position to withhold for long from others what others need to live. Sooner or later they face violent efforts at changing an order in which a few privileged people spiral their standards of living while excluding others.

The Bourbon courtiers and their whole system were swept away when outside pressure was matched by a growing conviction amongst the beneficiaries themselves that the disparities of privilege were as unjust as they were artificial.

We can either espouse and implement a peace built on the "solidarity of mankind" and true justice or we can face the dreadful consequences of the unsolved problem, namely, wars, strife and disaster.—THE ENSIGN, Montreal, Canada, Sept. 13, 1952.

The Church and the Workers' Struggle

THERE is some ground for fear that the reports which have appeared in our daily press of the statement of a visiting Augustinian priest on the subject of trade unions may lead to misunderstanding about what the Church's attitude really is towards these organizations.

The notion that responsible ecclesiastical authorities either are now, or have ever been, hostile to trade unionism as such, can only be entertained by those who are grossly ignorant of the facts, or blinded by anti-Catholic prejudices. The truth is precisely the contrary. When Leo XIII issued his great social encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, in 1891, he drew violent attention to the misery and degradation of the working-class, which was the great scandal of the modern world, as slavery had been of the ancient. This letter was the culmination of a work begun long before in Western Europe and Italy, with the encouragement of the Papacy. In it, the Holy Father insisted upon the right of workers to form

unions for their mutual protection and well-being as a "natural" one, which no state could lawfully deny: and he prayed that their numbers might increase. Of course, he recognized—as all who are capable of clear thinking must—that anti-social and lawless associations must be suppressed by public authorities for the sake of the common good: but he was careful to insist that this right did not justify the violation of individual rights or the imposition of unreasonable regulations by those in power under color of social protection. Pope Leo was also very well aware of the real dangers of unionism—in particular, the control exercised by anti-Christian revolutionaries and "secret leaders" whose aim was social subversion: to counter these, he wished Christian trade unions to be formed wherever possible—as was done in many parts of Europe. . . .

The trouble with the unionism we know today is that it has grown out of the things that divide men in the industrial field rather than from a recognition of the common interests of those engaged in the same enterprise. The trade union, on one side, faces the employers' organization on the other, each embattled to secure its sectional interest. The employers are out to build up profits and reduce costs, and to secure "a free hand" in control. The workers' leaders want as large a "cut off the joint" as they can extract for their union members.

The struggle between them is very commonly fought out—like the conflicts of the baronial gangs in medieval England—with regard to the “common good” or the requirements of production or essential services. In the case of the workers, bitter memories of past injustice often serve to perpetuate an obstinate “militancy” which frustrates the hope of rational conciliation, no less than “not an inch” attitudes to concession on the other side. Finally, the social conflict is exacerbated by the presence of a revolutionary “fifth column” whose aim is to use the industrial weapon for its own sinister purposes: and whose entrenched power in certain “key” unions has become a grave menace to national security in this and other lands.

In a word, “union solidarity” and the “class-consciousness” which binds workers together as brethren are capable of being distorted dangerously, just as are patriotism and even religious enthusiasm. This truth, however, does not make them evil things in themselves. Just as the Church has always shown sympathy with national and local cultures and feelings, so she approves this sense of community among toilers, and pays due heed to it in her design for the social apostolate. The father of Communism declared that the proletarians of the world must *save themselves* and the late Pope was no less convinced than Marx that the trained

apostles of the working-class must come from the workers’ ranks, reflecting their mentality and aspirations. The defects of trade unionism are to be cured, not by Catholic denunciations of the evils of Socialism, Communism and anti-social sectionalism rampant in the movement, but by the active, intelligent participation of Christian workers in the life of their unions, in order to penetrate them with a new spirit, and give them a truer understanding of the requirements of social justice for their own section, in relation to the rights and well-being of the whole community.—*THE TRIBUNE, Melbourne, Australia*, May 15, 1952.

Soviet Alibi for Murder

HERE is more news for the myopic “liberals” who still try to keep a faint breath of life in the idea that it is possible for Communism and freedom to live together. It is not new news—just confirmation No. 1,864,927 of the unchanging and unchangeable operation of Stalin & Co.’s formula for destroying religion: “Strike the shepherd and scatter the flock.” From Paris, NCWC News Service reports that a Bulgarian Communist “court” has sentenced to death a bishop and three priests in a procedure which *Osservatore Romano* flatly and correctly describes as “nothing but a useless alibi for a premeditated slaying.”

The same court "tried" a group of 28 Bulgarian priests and 12 Catholic lay people and handed down the following sentences: two priests were given 20 years' imprisonment, six received terms of 15 years, two of 14 years, and eleven of 12 years. Fifteen others, including a nun, were sentenced to three to five years. The gradation of sentences was intended, no doubt, to impress the gullible with the carefully measured quality of Communist "justice" and the solicitude of the judges lest one of the accused be penalized out of proportion to his "crime."

The "trial" followed the standard pattern: all the accused "confessed" their guilt, asked for "just punishment and clemency" and begged for a chance to mitigate "their guilt before the nation."

That's the dark side of that particular, and familiar, picture. A bright and comforting side is the statement of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris to the congregation of the Foundry Metho-

dist Church at Washington, D. C. Dr. Harris said:

We proclaim our kinship with the Church leaders persecuted for righteousness' sake. . . .

Of course these priests are guilty of the charges. That is their glory. How could they fail to be guilty of endeavoring to thwart the twisted, slavish system which denies and blasphemous Him Whose heralds they are? They were ordered to put Caesar above Christ and, like the early martyrs, they refused.

To say that they are guilty is simply to say that they will not betray their faith. This Protestant pulpit applauds and honors them. . . . We proclaim that as fellow Christians we are with them and for them in our sympathy and prayers and, I may add, in our determination, God helping us, to bring to naught the Soviet plot to enslave the world.

It is unnecessary to emphasize the value of Dr. Harris' statement as an example of the Christian good-will which is more extensive than we sometimes realize and which is essential to the maintenance of a solid front against the deadly enemy of all believers. — COLUMBIA, New Haven, Conn., November 1952.



Threat from Asiatic Barbarism

Who wrote: "There is but one alternative for Europe: either Asiatic barbarism, under Muscovite direction, will burst around its head like an avalanche, or else it must re-establish Poland, thus putting 20 million heroes between itself and Asia, and gaining a breathing space for the accomplishment of its social regeneration"?

The answer is Karl Marx, in 1867. *Douglas Woodruff in the TABLET, London, England, Nov. 8, 1952.*

Documentation

**THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION
OF HIS HOLINESS
POPE PIUS XII**

Concerning the Discipline to be Observed with Respect to the Eucharistic Fast*

(“CHRISTUS DOMINUS”)

**PIUS, BISHOP
SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD
FOR AN EVERLASTING REMEMBRANCE**

CHIRST the Lord “on the night in which He was betrayed” (*I Cor.* 11:23), when for the last time He kept the Pasch of the old law, after He had supped (cf. *Luke* 22:20) gave bread to His disciples, saying: “This is My Body which shall be given up for you” (*I Cor.* 11:24); and He likewise presented the chalice to them, saying: “This is my blood of the new covenant, which is being shed for many” (*Matt.* 26:28), “Do this in remembrance of me” (cf. *I Cor.* 11:24 f.). From these passages out of Holy Scripture, it is completely obvious that our Divine Redeemer wished to substitute, in place of this final Passover ceremony in which a lamb was eaten according to the rite of the Hebrews, a new Pasch which would endure until the end of the world, that is, the eating of the Immaculate Lamb who was to be immolated for the life of the world. Thus the new Pasch of the new law put an end to the old Passover and the truth emerged from the shadow (cf. the Hymn “Lauda Sion” in the *Roman Missal*).

But since the conjoining of the two suppers was so arranged as to signify the transfer from the old Pasch to the new, it is easy to see why the Church, in renewing the Eucharistic Sacrifice at the command of the Divine Redeemer and in commemoration of Him, could depart from the custom of the ancient love-feast and introduce the Eucharistic fast.

From the very earliest time the custom was observed of administering the

* This translation and the one which follows were made by a group of scholars at the Catholic University of America and distributed by NCWC News Service.

Eucharist to the faithful who were fasting (cf. Pope Benedict XIV, *De synodo diocesano*, 6, cap. 8, n. 10). Towards the end of the fourth century fasting was prescribed by many Councils for those who were going to celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice. So it was that the Council of Hippo in the year 393 issued this decree: "The Sacrament of the altar shall be offered only by those who are fasting" (Conc. Hipp., can. 28: *Mansi*, III, 923). Shortly afterwards, in the year 397, the Third Council of Carthage issued this same command, using the very same words (Conc. Carth III, cap. 29: *Mansi*, III, 885). At the beginning of the fifth century this custom can be called quite common and immemorial. Hence St. Augustine affirms that the Holy Eucharist is always received by people who are fasting and likewise that this custom is observed throughout the entire world (cf. St. Augustine, Ep. 54, *Ad Jan.*, cap. 6: *Migne*, PL, 33, 203).

HOLINESS WITH CHRIST

Doubtless this way of doing things was based upon very serious reasons, among which there can be mentioned first of all the one the Apostle of the Gentiles deplores when he is dealing with the brotherly love-feast of the Christians (cf. *I Cor.* 11:21 ff.). Abstinence from food and drink is in accord with that highest reverence we owe to the supreme majesty of Jesus Christ when we are going to receive Him hidden under the veils of the Eucharist. And moreover, when we receive His precious Body and Blood before we take any food, we show clearly that this is the first and loftiest nourishment by which our soul is fed and its holiness increased. Hence the same St. Augustine gives this warning: "It has pleased the Holy Ghost that, to honor so great a Sacrament, the Lord's Body should enter the mouth of the Christian before other food" (St. Augustine, *loc. cit.*).

Not only does the Eucharistic fast pay due honor to our Divine Redeemer, it fosters piety also; and hence it can help to increase in us those most salutary fruits of holiness which Christ, the Source and Author of all good, wishes us who are enriched by His grace to bring forth.

Moreover, everyone with experience will recognize that, by the very laws of human nature, when the body is not weighted down by food the mind more easily is lifted up and is by a more ardent virtue moved to meditate upon that hidden and transcendent Mystery that works in the soul, as in a temple, to the increase of divine charity.

The solicitude of the Church for the preservation of the Eucharistic fast may be perceived also from the fact that the Church, in decreeing this fast, imposed serious penalties for its violation. Thus the Seventh Council of Toledo in the year 646 threatened with excommunication anyone who should say Mass after having broken his fast (Conc. Tolet. VII, cap. 2: *Mansi*, X, 768). In the year 572 the Third Council of Braga (Conc. Bracar. III, can. 10: *Mansi*, IX 841), and in the year 585 the Second Council of Macon (Conc. Matiscon. II, can. 6: *Mansi*, IX, 952) had already pronounced that anyone who incurred this guilt should be deposed from his office and deprived of his honors.

As time went by, however, on careful consideration it was sometimes judged opportune because of particular circumstances to relax in some

measure this law of fasting as it affected the faithful. So it is that the Council of Constance, in the year 1415, while confirming the venerable law of fasting, somewhat moderated it: ". . . the authority of the sacred canons and the praiseworthy and approved custom of the Church have observed and do observe the following: that Mass should not be said after the celebrant has taken food, nor should Holy Communion be received by the faithful without fasting, unless in case of illness or of some other necessity conceded or admitted by right or by the Church" (Conc. Constant. sess. XIII: *Mansi*, XXVII, 727).

It has pleased Us to recall these things so that all may understand that We, despite the fact that new conditions of the times and of affairs have moved Us to grant not a few faculties and favors on this subject, still wish through this Apostolic Letter to confirm the supreme force of the law and custom dealing with the Eucharistic fast; and that We Wish also to admonish those who are able to observe that same law that they should continue diligently to observe it, so that only those who need these concessions can enjoy them according to the nature of their need.

FREQUENT COMMUNION

We are most effectively consoled—and it is right to speak of this here, even though briefly—when We see that devotion to the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar is increasing day by day, not only in the souls of the faithful, but also in what has to do with the splendor of the divine worship, which has often been made evident in public popular demonstrations. The careful directions of Sovereign Pontiffs have doubtless contributed a great deal to this effect, and especially that of the Blessed Pius X who, summoning all to renew the primitive custom of the Church, urged them to receive the Bread of Angels very frequently, even daily if possible (S. Congr. Concilii, Decretum *Sacra Tridentina Synodus*, Dec. 20, 1905: *Acta S. Sedis*, XXXVIII, 400 ff.). Inviting the little ones to this heavenly food, he wisely decreed that the precept of Holy Confession and Holy Communion has reference to every one of those who have reached the use of reason (S. Congr. de Sac., Decretum *Quam singulari*, Aug. 8, 1910: *AAS*, II, 577 ff.). This same rule is prescribed in the Code of Canon Law (CIC, can. 863; cf. can. 854, § 5). The faithful, responding generously and willingly to these directions of the Sovereign Pontiffs, have approached ever more frequently to the sacred Table. May this hunger for the heavenly Bread and the thirst for the Sacred Blood burn in all men of every age and of every walk of life!

It should nevertheless be noted that the times in which we live and their peculiar conditions have brought many modifications in the habits of society and in the activities of common life. Out of these there may arise serious difficulties which could keep men from partaking of the divine mysteries if the law of the Eucharistic fast is to be observed in the way in which it had to be observed up to the present time.

In the first place, it is evident to all that today the clergy are not sufficiently numerous to cope with the increasingly serious needs of the faithful. Especially on feast days they are subject to overwork, when they have to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice at a late hour and frequently twice or three

times the same day, and when at times they are forced to travel a great distance so as not to leave considerable portions of their flocks without Holy Mass. Such tiring apostolic work undoubtedly weakens the health of priests. This is all the more true because, over and above the offering of the Holy Mass and the explanation of the Gospel, they must likewise hear confessions, give catechetical instruction, devote ever-increasing care and take ever more pains in completing the duties of the other parts of their ministry. They must also diligently look after those matters that are demanded by the warfare against God and His Church, a warfare that has grown so widespread and bitter at the present time.

Now Our mind and heart go out to those especially who, working far from their own native country in far distant lands, have generously answered the invitation and the command of the Lord: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations" (*Matt. 28:19*). We are speaking of the heralds of the Gospel who, overcoming the most difficult and multitudinous labors and all manner of difficulty in traveling, strive with all their might to have the light of the Christian religion illumine all, and to nourish their flocks, who but very recently received the Catholic faith, with the Bread of Angels which nourishes virtue and fosters piety.

Almost in the same situation are those Catholics who, living in many localities cared for by Catholic missionaries, or who, living in other places and not having among them their own priests, must wait until a late hour for the coming of another priest that they may partake of the Eucharist and nourish themselves with the divine food.

Furthermore, since the introduction of machines for every sort of use, it very often happens that many workers—in factories, or in the land and water transportation fields, or in other public utility services—are employed not only during the day, but even during the night, in alternate shifts. As a result, their weakened condition compels them at times to take some nourishment. But, in this way, they are prevented from approaching the Eucharist fasting.

Mothers also are often unable to approach the Eucharist before they discharge their household duties, duties that demand of them many hours of work.

In the same way, it happens that there are many boys and girls in school who desire to respond to the divine invitation: "Let the little children come to me" (*Mark 10:14*). They are entirely confident that "He who dwells among the lilies" will protect their innocence of soul and purity of life against the enticements to which youth is subjected, the snares of the world. But at times it is most difficult for them, before going to school, to go to church and be nourished with the Bread of Angels and then return home to partake of the food they need.

Furthermore, it should be noted that it often happens, at the present time, that great crowds of people travel from one place to another in the afternoon hours to take part in religious celebrations or to hold meetings on social questions. Now, if on these occasions it were allowed to offer the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which is the living Fruit of divine grace and which commands our will to burn with the desire of acquiring virtue, there is no

doubt that strength could be drawn from this by which all would be stirred profoundly to think and act in a Christian manner and to obey legitimate laws.

To these special considerations it seems opportune to add some which have reference to all. Although in our days medical science and that study which is called hygiene have made great progress and have helped greatly to cut down the number of deaths, especially among the young, nevertheless conditions of life at the present time and the hardships which flow from the cruel wars of this century are of such nature that they have greatly weakened bodily constitution and health.

For these reasons, and especially so that renewed piety towards the Eucharist may be all the more readily increased, many Bishops from various countries have asked, in official letters, that this law of fast be somewhat mitigated. Actually, the Apostolic See has kindly granted special faculties and permissions in this regard to both priests and faithful. As regards these concessions, We can cite the Decree entitled, *Post Editum*, given for the sick by the Sacred Congregation of the Council, December 7, 1906 (*Acta S. Sedis*, XXXIX, p. 603 ff.); and the Letter of the 22nd of May, 1923, from the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office to the local Ordinaries in favor of priests (*S.S. Congregationis S. Officii Litterae Locorum Ordinariis datae super ieiunio eucharistico ante Missam*: *AAS*, XV, p. 151 ff.).

In these latter days, the petitions of the Bishops have become more frequent and urgent, and the faculties granted were more ample, especially those that were bestowed in view of the war. This, without doubt, clearly indicates that there are new and grave reasons, reasons that are not occasional but rather general, because of which it is very difficult, in these diversified circumstances, both for the priest to celebrate the Eucharistic Sacrifice and for the faithful to receive the Bread of Angels fasting.

Wherefore, that we may meet these grave inconveniences and difficulties, that the different indults may not lead to inconsistent practice, We have deemed it necessary to lay down the discipline of the Eucharistic fast, by mitigating it in such a way that, in the greatest manner possible, all, in view of the peculiar circumstances of time, place and the faithful, may be able to fulfill this law more easily. We, by this decree, trust that We may be able to add not a little to the increase of Eucharistic piety, and in this way to move and stir up all to partake at the Table of the Angels. This, without doubt, will increase the glory of God and the holiness of the Mystical Body of Christ.

GIVES RULES

By Our Apostolic authority We decree and command all the following:

Rule I. The law of the Eucharistic fast from midnight continues in force for all of those who do not come under the special conditions which We are going to set forth in this Apostolic Letter. In the future it shall be a general and common principle for all, both priests and faithful, that natural water does not break the Eucharistic fast.

Rule II. The sick, even when they are not confined to bed, can, on the prudent advice of a confessor, take something in the form of beverage or of

true medicine. This does not hold for alcoholic beverages. The same faculty is given to sick priests who are going to say Mass.

Rule III. Priests who are going to say Mass at late hours, or after onerous work of the sacred ministry, or after a long journey, can take something by way of beverage. They cannot take alcoholic beverages. They should abstain, however, for the space of one hour before they say Mass.

Rule IV. Those who say Mass twice or three times can consume the ablutions. In such cases, however, the ablution must be made with water alone, not with wine.

Rule V. Likewise the faithful, even those not sick, who by reason of some serious inconvenience—that is, by reason of tiring work, by reason of the late hours at which alone it is possible for them to attend Mass, or by reason of a long journey which they must take—could not approach the Eucharistic table completely fasting, can, on the advice of a prudent confessor, while the need lasts, take something to drink, to the exclusion of alcoholic beverages, but they must abstain at least for the space of one hour before they are nourished by the Bread of Angels.

Rule VI. If the circumstance calls for it as necessary, We grant to the local Ordinaries the right to permit the celebration of Mass in the evening, as we said, but in such wise that the Mass shall not begin before four o'clock in the afternoon, on holy days of obligation still observed, on those which formerly were observed, on the first Friday of every month, and also on those days on which solemn celebrations are held with a large attendance, and also, in addition to these days, on one day a week; with the requirement that the priest observe a fast of three hours from solid food and alcoholic beverages, and of one hour from non-alcoholic beverages. At these Masses the faithful may approach the Holy Table, observing the same rule as regards the Eucharistic fast, the presumption of Canon 857 remaining in force.

In mission territories, in consideration of the very unusual conditions there prevailing, on account of which it often happens that there are only a few priests to visit the distant missions, the local Ordinaries can grant to the preachers of the Gospel faculties to celebrate evening Masses on other days of the week also.

WARNS AGAINST ABUSES

Local Ordinaries shall carefully see that every interpretation is avoided that would stretch these faculties and that all abuse and irreverence in this matter is prevented. For in granting these faculties which the conditions of persons, places and times demand today, We ardently desire to emphasize the force and the value of the Eucharistic fast for those who are to receive our Divine Redeemer hidden under the Eucharistic veils. Besides, as often as the inconvenience of the body is diminished, the soul must supply as far as it can either by internal penance or by other means, in accordance with the traditional custom of the Church, which is wont to command other works to be done when it mitigates the fast.

Hence, those who may enjoy the faculties granted in this matter should raise fervent prayers to heaven to adore God, to thank Him and especially to expiate for sins and beg Him for new heavenly aid. Since all must recog-

nize that the Eucharist "has been instituted as the permanent memorial of the Passion" (S. Thom., *Opusc.* LVII, Office for the Feast of Corpus Christi, 4th lesson: *Opera Omnia*, Rome, 1570, vol. XVII), let them from their hearts elicit those sentiments of Christian humility and Christian patience which meditation on the sufferings and death of our Divine Redeemer must arouse. Also, to our Divine Redeemer who, ever immolating Himself on our altars, is repeating the greatest proof of His love, let all offer increased fruits of charity toward their neighbors. For this reason all shall cooperate toward daily fulfilling the words of the Apostle of the Gentiles: "Because the bread is one, we, though many, are one body, all of us who partake of the one bread" (*I Cor.* 10:17).

Whatever decrees are contained in this letter we wish to be stable, ratified and valid, notwithstanding anything to the contrary, even what may be worthy of most special mention. All other privileges and faculties, in whatever way they may have been granted by the Holy See, are abolished, so that all may everywhere properly and equally observe this legislation.

All that has been decreed above shall be in force from the day of promulgation through the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis*.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome, January 6, 1953, the Feast of the Epiphany, in the fourteenth year of our Pontificate.

POPE PIUS XII.

An Instruction of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office on the Discipline to be Observed with Reference to the Eucharistic Fast

The Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus*, issued today by the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII happily reigning, grants several faculties and dispensations with respect to the observance of the law of the Eucharistic fast. It also confirms, in great measure and substantially, the rules of the Code of Canon Law (can. 808 and 858, 1) for the priests and the faithful able to observe that law of the Eucharistic fast. Nevertheless, the favorable first order of this Constitution, according to which natural water (that is, without the addition of any element) no longer breaks the Eucharistic fast (Const. Rule 1), is extended to these people also. But, with regard to the other concessions, these can be used only by priests and by the faithful who find themselves in the conditions described in the Constitution, or by those who say evening Masses or receive Holy Communion at such Masses authorized by the Ordinaries within the limits of the new faculties granted to them.

And so, in order that the rules with regard to such concessions may be observed uniformly everywhere, in order to avoid any interpretation which would make these faculties appear more extensive than they really are, and in order to prevent every abuse in this matter, this Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, at the direction and by the command of the Sovereign Pontiff himself, has issued the following:

WITH REGARD TO THE SICK, EITHER PRIESTS OR FAITHFUL

(RULE II OF THE CONSTITUTION)

1. The faithful who are sick, even though not confined to bed, may take something in the form of beverage, though not an alcoholic beverage, if, by reason of their sickness, they cannot, without real inconvenience, observe a complete fast up to the time they receive Holy Communion. They can also take something in the line of medicine, either liquid (but not alcoholic), or solid, as long as what they take is real medicine, prescribed by a physician or commonly esteemed as such. It must be noted that any solid taken as nourishment cannot be considered as medicine.

2. The conditions under which a person may be able to take advantage of this dispensation from the law of fasting, for which no time limit preceding Holy Communion is prescribed, must be judged very prudently by the confessor. Without his advice no one can use this dispensation. The Confessor, however, can give his advice either when he is hearing confessions or privately apart from the confessional. He may also give this advice once so that the person to whom he gives it may always act upon it as long as the conditions of this same sickness last.

3. Sick priests, even though they are not confined to their beds, may use a like dispensation if they are going to say Mass or receive the Holy Eucharist.

WITH REGARD TO PRIESTS PLACED IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

(CONSTITUTION, RULES III AND IV)

4. Priests who are not sick, but who are going to say Mass

- a) at a late hour (that is, after nine o'clock),
- b) after onerous work of the sacred ministry (for example, from early in the morning or for a long time), or
- c) after a long journey (that is, at least about two kilometres walking or a proportionally longer trip in terms of the classes of vehicles used, the difficulties of the journey and the condition of the person),

may take something in the form of drink, but not any alcoholic beverage.

5. The three cases indicated above are such as to take in all the circumstances in which the legislator intends to grant the above-mentioned faculty. Consequently every interpretation which would make these faculties seem more extensive must be avoided.

6. Priests who are in such circumstances can take something in the line of drink once or many times, but they must keep the fast for one hour before they say Mass.

7. Moreover, all priests who are going to say Mass twice or three times the same day can, in the earlier Masses, consume the two ablutions prescribed by the rubrics of the Missal, but using only the water which, according to the new principle, does not break the fast.

The priest who says three Masses, one after the other, on Christmas or on All Souls Day, is bound to follow the rubrics with regard to the ablutions.

8. If it should happen that a priest who is obliged to say Mass two or three times the same day should inadvertently consume wine in the ablution, he is not prevented from saying the second and the third Mass.

WITH REGARD TO THE FAITHFUL PLACED IN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

(CONSTITUTION, RULE V)

9. Likewise the faithful who are unable to keep the Eucharistic fast, not by reason of sickness, but because of some serious difficulty, can take something in the line of drink. They cannot, however, take any alcoholic beverage, and they must fast for an hour before the reception of Holy Communion.

10. The cases wherein there is such a serious difficulty (*grave incommodum*) are these three. It is wrong to add any others.

a) Work that weakens, started before Holy Communion. Such is the function of laborers in factories, transport and dock workers, or workers in other public utilities employed in day and night shifts; of those who, by reason of duty or of charity, must stay awake during the night (for example, nurses, night watchmen, etc.); and of pregnant women and mothers of families who must spend a long time on their household duties before they can go to Church, etc.

b) The late hour at which Holy Communion is received. There are many of the faithful who can have a priest to say Mass among them only at a late hour. There are likewise many children for whom it would be too difficult, before going to school, to go to the Church, receive Holy Communion and then go back home to eat breakfast.

c) A long journey which must be made in order to reach the Church. As has been explained above (n. 4), a trip is to be considered long for this purpose if it covers a walk of about a mile and a quarter, or a journey that is longer in proportion to the vehicles used, the difficulty of the journey itself, or the condition of the person making the journey.

11. The nature of such serious difficulty must be judged prudently by a confessor either while he is hearing confessions or in a private conversation with the one seeking advice. The faithful cannot receive the Holy Eucharist not fasting without the confessor's advice. The confessor can give his advice once and for all, to be effective as long as the cause of the serious difficulty remains.

WITH REFERENCE TO EVENING MASSES

(CONSTITUTION, RULE VI)

By the force of the Constitution the Ordinaries of places (cf. can. 198) have the faculty of permitting the saying of evening Masses in their own territory, should circumstances render this necessary. This holds true despite the command of canon 821, § 1. The common good sometimes demands the saying of Mass after midday: for example, for the workers in some industries who work their shifts even on feast days, for those categories of workers who must be on the job during the morning hours of feast days, like dock workers, and likewise for those who have come in great numbers and from considerable distances for some religious or social celebration, etc.

12. Such Masses, however, may not be said before four o'clock in the afternoon, and may be celebrated only on the following definitely stated days. These are:

- a) Holydays of obligation according to the rule of canon 1247, § 1;
- b) Feasts which were formerly holydays of obligation but which now are not. These are listed in the Index published by the Sacred Congregation of the Council on Dec. 28, 1919 (AAS, XII, 1920, 42 f.).
- c) First Fridays of the month;
- d) Other solemn occasions which are celebrated with great gatherings of the people;
- e) On one day of the week other than those enumerated above, if the good of special classes of persons should demand it.

13. Priests who say afternoon Masses, as well as the faithful who receive Holy Communion at these Masses, may, at the meal which is permitted up to three hours before the beginning of Mass or Communion, take with due moderation the alcoholic beverages which are ordinarily taken at meals, (for example, wine, beer and the like). They may not take strong liquors. Before or after this meal they may take something in the form of beverage (but no alcoholic beverage at all), up until one hour before Mass or Communion.

14. Priests may not say a morning and an evening Mass on the same day unless they have the explicit permission to say Mass twice or three times the same day, according to the rule of can. 806.

Likewise the faithful cannot receive Holy Communion in the morning and the evening of the same day, according to the norm of canon 857.

15. The faithful, even though they may not be of the number of those for whom the offering of an evening Mass was decreed, may freely receive Holy Communion at this Mass or immediately before it or immediately after it, if they obey the directions given above with reference to the Eucharistic fast.

16. In places where the law for the missions rather than the general law is in force, the Ordinaries may permit evening Masses on all the days of the week under the same conditions.

ADMONITIONS ON THE OBSERVANCE OF THE RULES

17. Ordinaries must carefully see to it that every abuse and irreverence towards the Blessed Sacrament is entirely avoided.

18. They must also take care that the new discipline be observed uniformly by all their subjects, and they must teach these subjects that all faculties and dispensations, both territorial and personal, which have hitherto been granted by the Holy See have been revoked.

19. The interpretation of the Constitution and of this Instruction must faithfully keep to the text, and must not in any way enlarge the highly favorable faculties which have been granted. With regard to customs which may differ from the new discipline, let the abrogating clause be kept in mind: "Notwithstanding any disposition whatever to the contrary, even those worthy of most special mention."

20. The Ordinaries and the priests, who ought to take advantage of these faculties granted by the Holy See, should zealously stir up the faithful to assist at Mass and receive Holy Communion frequently. They should take advantage of every opportunity, especially by preaching, to promote the spiritual good for the sake of which the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII has published the Constitution.

The Sovereign Pontiff, approving this Instruction, decreed that it should be promulgated by publication in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, together with the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus*.

From the Palace of the Holy Office, on the 6th day of January, in the year 1953.

Joseph Cardinal Pizzardo, *Secretary*
Alfredo Ottaviani, *Assessor*



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph C. Mulhern

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.